

# AMERICA

A·CATHOLIC·REVIEW·OF·THE·WEEK

VOL. XXII. No. 24 }  
WHOLE No. 550 }

April 3, 1920

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

## Chronicle

**England.**—In a statement made to the House of Commons, the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, officially declared that the French Government was taking the requisite steps for the defense of Cilicia, dispatching ships and "powerful reinforcements."

### *The Armenian Question*

He announced at the same time that "identical instructions for immediate and drastic action" at Constantinople were sent by the Governments of France, Italy and Great Britain; he did not, however, specify the nature of these instructions. It was, comments the *Manchester Guardian*, certainly time for such instructions to be sent. For whether the precise number of Armenians massacred at Marash be 18,000 or only 15,000, as the Prime Minister rather optimistically was inclined to think, they were Armenians under special promise of Allied and specifically French protection.

It is not improbable that the Armenians may have committed some acts of retaliation. The most peaceable race, again comments the *Manchester Guardian*, when it has been subject to murder or outrage at intervals for years, will occasionally turn upon its persecutor "to the great scandal, it appears, of a certain order of mind." But the *Guardian* adds: "What excuse such reprisals may be supposed to offer for the invasion of Cilicia and the massacre of the Armenians concentrated there, who can hardly be guilty of outrages in Turkish territory, we do not understand." The members of the Caliphate Delegation asked for an impartial inquiry into the events of 1915 at Van, Bitlis and Erzeroum. A more extensive and detailed report of the entire dealings of the Turks with the Armenians and of the latter with the Turks would not be at all favorable to the Turkish cause. But in 1915, the Armenians in their attempted rebellion were acting on the side of the Allies. In addition to the inherent justice of their cause, this should be for the Allies a further reason to protect them from the vengeance of the Turks.

Speaking of the retention of the Sultan at Constantinople, the *Guardian* says that there is "every desire to have regard to Moslem feeling" concerning his position there. "But there are some things that cannot be done." "We could not," it adds, "as Mr. Lloyd George said weeks ago, leave the Turk, after what has passed, in

possession of the Straits. With great difficulty, for the sake of Moslem sentiment, public sentiment was induced to acquiesce in his retention at Constantinople." But, as the *Manchester journal* carefully notes, it acquiesced in full consciousness that in so doing it was sowing the seeds of future intrigue and possible war. But it did so, provided always that the passage of the Straits could be secured and the safety of the Christians in Turkey could be guaranteed. But the first reaction of the announcement that the Turks were to remain in Constantinople was apparently to encourage the renewal of the massacres. These massacres then and the subsequent invasion by the Turks of Cilicia had to be taken as definitely canceling any assurances given by the Turkish Government, and reopening the whole question. Only the most drastic measures and the most insistent pressure by the Allied Governments at Constantinople can now save the remnant of the Armenian people.

As the *Guardian* implicitly admits, the retention of the Sultan at Constantinople is a mistake. For the third time in the last fifty years Europe has the right and the opportunity to end his rule there. When fifty years ago the Pope was deprived of his justly acquired temporal power, European Governments showed no scruple in acquiescing in the robbery and thus outraging the feelings of millions of Catholics throughout the world. Why should they now be so tender with regard to the cruel and unjust rule of the intruding Turk?

**France.**—A vigorous attack on the British policy of revision of the Versailles Treaty and upon the alleged domination of the English Government in the Allied

### *The Millerand Cabinet Sustained*

Councils marked the beginning of the long-expected debate in the Chamber of Deputies on the French Foreign policy. From the beginning it was seen that the fate of the Millerand Government was at stake. A persistent rumor in the Chamber itself was to the effect that M. A. Briand had deliberately planned the overthrow of the present Government in order to take the Premiership himself. The leadership of the debate however was assumed by ex-Premier Barthou, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Chamber. Writing in the *Echo de Paris*, "Pertinax" saw the possibility of an inter-allied crisis growing out of the attack on M. Mil-

lerand. It was undeniable, he said, that great discontent against the Allies and notably against England prevailed in French political circles and the interpellation of Louis Barthou to the President of the Council upon the present condition of French foreign policy gave this sentiment an opportunity to express itself. The Versailles Treaty, he added, has been in force three months, and in all questions of its application, there have been points of view diametrically opposed. Pertinax points out especially the cases of the war criminals, the extension of delays in the evacuation of the Rhine territory because of insufficient shipments of coal, the question of the disarmament of the Ruhr district. Fundamentally France expects from "a preponderance of force in her favor the accomplishment by Germany of the clauses of the Versailles Treaty," "she wants to build a system of alliances to restrain Germany, whom she considers inevitably bound to seek revenge." England, on the other hand, says this writer, is willing to trust Germany, whom she regards as reformed by the war and become democratic and pacific. "Her present attitude," he adds, "is dominated much more by anxiety about her Asiatic interests than her European interests."

In his speech, the motives of which somewhat puzzled not only his opponents but even his closest friends, M. Barthou protested that France was not a militaristic nation, but that she intended to see that the treaty was enforced, and that, if necessary, she would keep an army to have it done. He arraigned the treaty-revisionists, accusing them of making all revisions in favor of Germany and against France, denounced Lloyd George for what he called his backing down on the question of punishment of the German war-culprits, expressed his confidence in the American people and stated it as his conviction that America would only take her place in the League of Nations to build a new world out of the ashes of the old. England, continued M. Barthou, had secured the mastery of the seas, had obtained the destruction of the German fleet and now had nothing to fear from outside aggression. He also said that President Wilson had come to Paris preaching the freedom of the seas, but "after the English took him on a trip to London, that doctrine appeared to have been forgotten." M. Barthou's attack on England brought a protest from the Right which accused him of speaking like Caillaux, the ex-Minister, now indicted for treason. His declaration that a peace with Soviet Russia seemed to be a necessity caused some surprise as M. Millerand has so far stood out against such a measure. M. Barthou was at this stage reminded that he had been schooled in the matter of the Soviet by Sadoul, the French officer now under a death-sentence because he went over to the Bolsheviks.

The supposed friendly interpellation of M. Barthou had by this time turned into a direct attack on the Millerand Government. But it failed, and on March 28 the Premier was sustained by a decisive vote, 518 to 70.

**Germany.**—A new cabinet, which is said to meet with the approbation of the labor federation, has been created. Its Premier, Hermann Mueller, as well as its Minister

*New Cabinet* of Labor, Herr Schlicke, are Majority Socialists. The remaining posts  
*The Spartacans* in the cabinet are almost equally

divided between the Majority Socialists, Democrats and Centrists. They are thus given in the original draft: Minister of Transport, Gustav Bauer (Socialist); Minister without Portfolio, Dr. Edouard David (Socialist); Vice-Premier and Minister of the Interior, Herr Koch (Democrat); Minister of Defence, Herr Gessler (Democrat); Minister of Justice, Herr Plunck (Democrat); Minister of Finance, Captain Fischer Cuno (Centrist and Manager of the Hamburg-American Steamship Company); Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Johann Giesberts (Centrist); Minister of Food, Andreas Hermes (Centrist); Minister of the Treasury, Dr. Wirth (Centrist).

In a telegram received from Hamburg, Fischer Cuno refused to accept his appointment, on the ground that too many political and non-political objections had been raised against it. Gustav Bauer was transferred to his position and Dr. Bell was made Minister of Transport. Dr. Wirth, the new Minister of the Treasury, is a leader of the Centrist party in South Germany and was formerly a Minister of Finance in the Baden Government and a member of the Baden Diet. Johann Giesberts has long been known as a great Catholic labor leader. The third Centrist, Andreas Hermes, was a departmental chief of the Prussian Ministry of Agriculture. It is to be noted that no Spartacan, or extreme radical, was admitted into the cabinet. The chief concession that seems to have been made to the Spartacans was the elimination of Gustav Noske's name. He is succeeded by Herr Gessler, chief burgomaster of Nuremberg, of whom little is known, since he has not actively participated hitherto in national politics.

Comparatively little was said during the past week of the fighting that still continues in various parts of Germany. It has been particularly bitter around Wesel, in Rhenish Prussia. The Spartacist leaders are said to be losing control of their troops in the Ruhr area. There has been heavy shelling and machine-gun fire. In Chemnitz, Saxony, the Communists are firmly intrenched in control and prepared to resist attacks by the Government troops. Duisburg reports announce that the Workers' Executive Committee has issued a manifesto demanding vigorous continuance of the struggle in the Ruhr district. All bank deposits and all unrationed food-stuffs are said to be declared confiscated by the manifesto. Workmen only and those who favor the proletariat dictatorship will be allowed to participate in the elections which are now to be held there. In the opinion of official circles in Berlin an agreement will soon be reached with the militant workmen in the Ruhr region.



**Ireland.**—Terror still reigns in Ireland; the British Government still continues to arrest and imprison the leaders of the people. During the week a large number of men were apprehended in the South and incarcerated in Belfast: later still Laurence Gennell, M. P., was arrested and thrown into prison without warrant or indictment. Murder of Sinn Feiners is still so common that the Irish papers declare the crimes are committed by British officials, police or soldiers. Naturally the English papers are exercised over conditions. As usual the London *Morning Post* shrieks for Irish blood, and calls upon Lord French to do his duty or resign. The *Times*, the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Express* speak of the reign of terror, and the *Daily News* scores Bonar Law for increasing the difficulty by announcing that he intended to allow one of the Irish prisoners, Alderman O'Brien, to starve himself to death, by a hunger strike. The Manchester *Guardian* deplores "the dreadful reign of terror into which Ireland has been delivered," but none of these papers suggests the proper remedy for the evil—the withdrawal of British troops from Ireland.

Much to the relief of America the Cooties are back in Ulster in an environment suitable to their dispositions and attainments. As was to be expected, they gave most glowing accounts of their American campaign, only to be met by this cablegram sent to the Manchester *Guardian* by the Protestant Friends of Ireland, whose office is in New York:

The Protestant Friends of Ireland incorporated, consisting of many prominent Protestant clergymen and laity including bishops, editors, judges, senators, congressmen, administrators of public offices, governors, philanthropists, army officers, college professors, writers, woman suffrage leaders, all of unassailable Americanism, protest against the misleading statements of Sir Edward Carson and members of the so-called Ulster delegation regarding their recent visit to America. Said delegation has grossly misrepresented the facts. Its members held only five mass-meetings, admission was by card only, with selected and unrepresentative audiences; all other meetings privately held in churches. Policy of secrecy and campaign of insinuation and innuendo, the repeated refusal to meet American Protestants in open debate, repetition of false statements created painful impression and strong resentment in many quarters. In many cities Protestant clergymen refused to sponsor the meetings, frequently objecting to the methods as wholly repugnant to principle of fair play. Invitations to them to speak were in some cases withdrawn. Many important cities such as San Francisco, Indianapolis, Seattle were necessarily omitted for lack of sponsors. Clergymen subsequently apologized for having allowed them to use their churches. Prominent Protestant laity attacked their bigotry and efforts to arouse religious dissensions in America. Most significant result of visit was organization of Protestant Friends of Ireland to combat propaganda of religious hatred fomented by Ulster parsons. Protestant Friends of Ireland have had open meetings in every important city of America with enthusiastic response. As result of extended and systematic contacts throughout country believe overwhelming majority in America favor Irish Self-determination.

Moreover, a prominent Presbyterian minister of Belfast,

Mr. Irwin, who recently arrived in the United States, declares that the Cooties did not speak in the name of Irish Protestantism.

Ireland's contribution to the Great War is still under discussion. A careful summary of government reports shows that at least 230,949 Irishmen from Ireland served under the British colors. Besides these, there were, of course, many Irishmen in the Australian, Canadian and American armies. The "Friends of Irish Freedom" submit this instructive tabulation taken principally from Lord Wimborne's and Macpherson's reports:

Total Irishmen in British Army, Aug. 2, 1914...	51,046
Enlistments in Army from Aug. 2, 1914, to Jan. 8, 1916 .....	86,277
Irishmen in British Navy, Aug. 2, 1914 .....	5,100
Enlistments in British Navy, Aug. 2, 1914, to Jan. 8, 1916 .....	3,446
Total to Jan. 8, 1916 .....	145,869
Army Enlistments in 1916 .....	19,057
Army Enlistments in 1917 .....	14,023
	178,949
Navy Enlistments, '16, '17, '18 .....	10,000
Army Enlistments, 1918 .....	7,000
Irish Residents Enlisted in England .....	35,000
	230,949

Further, on April 15, 1918, Macpherson sent these figures to the House of Commons

NUMBER OF MEN RECRUITED IN IRELAND					
	1914	1915	1916	1917	Total
Ulster ...	26,283	19,020	7,305	5,830	58,438
Rest .....	17,851	27,351	11,752	8,193	65,147
	44,134	46,371	19,057	14,023	123,585

Joseph Devlin informed Commons, and was not contradicted, that half of the Ulsterites were Nationalists, and hence anti-Carson. Mrs. J. R. Green points out that Unionist Antrim and Down showed a percentage of recruits to population of 1.36, whereas Republican Kilkenny, Waterford, Wexford and Tipperary recorded a percentage of 1.70. In other words Republican and Nationalist Ireland was very deeply in the war, in favor of the Allies.

**Mexico.**—Parts ix and x of the Fall findings repeat the sad story of the malevolent interference of the Wilson administration in Mexico's internal affairs and bring out

**Fall Findings—** some additional information, hitherto unknown to the American people.

**IX, X** For instance, Manuel Esteva states explicitly that Turner's "Barbarous Mexico," written in part by Turner and in part by the Socialist, Lazaro Gutierrez de Lara, marked the beginning of the Mexican revolution. He also declares that Standard Oil paid for the translation into English of de Lara's articles. Esteva

saw the check in payment (pp. 1362, 1363). Lind is again accused of "holding revolutionary meetings" in Vera Cruz to upset Huerta (p. 1363), and the story of his letter to Bryan advising that Mexico City be humbled by letting Villa loose in it is recounted (p. 1363). Esteva declares that before Villa entered Mexico City, his biography was written and screened, apparently, as is insinuated, to offer excuse for Villa's later actions in the capital. Esteva testifies that Bryan first informed him about the biography (pp. 1363, 1364). Further, the same witness says the State Department assured the Mexican ambassador it would investigate the Antilles shipment of arms to the revolutionists and stop it if might be, while, at the same time, the Treasury Department sent instructions to the New York customs official to facilitate the clearance of the boat (p. 1364).

Other witnesses testify to the wretched condition of the schools and the children; the atrocities are gone over again (p. 1441), also the looting of churches (p. 1455). So far part ix; part x is entirely taken up with the border raids and conditions on the border, subjects fully discussed before.

**Russia.**—Maxim Litvinoff, the Bolshevik Plenipotentiary at Copenhagen in a statement which the New York Times Paris correspondent sent on March 23, has outlined the Bolshevik's foreign policy.

*The Soviet's  
Foreign Policy*

He says that they are quite willing to let the little States that have arisen around them adopt any regime they like, but the Soviets claim the same treatment for themselves. M. Litvinoff continues:

If we obtain this formal guarantee that there will be no foreign intervention we will give on our side the same guarantee not to seek to intervene in the interior politics of other States. We make this offer in good faith. We do not wish any foreign alliances, but we do not wish to attack any one. We shall disarm as soon as freed from menace. We are convinced pacifists. We have had to fight because fight was forced on us, but we are anxious to lay down arms. We desire a renewal of normal commercial relations with other countries. Europe has need of Russian raw material and we have need of manufactured goods in return. We are ready to recognize the Russian debt—former loans with interest. We also solemnly declare that we will repulse any secret German advances seeking an alliance against the Entente. We do not wish to hear talk of any military combination whatever. The only military danger which forces us to keep our army is Polish imperialism, which German militarists are supporting. We are offering a loyal peace to Poland, but will not accept conditions which include in her frontier Russian people on the ground that they are being protected from Bolshevism.

The Polish Legation at Washington issued on March 26 a summary of the terms on which peace could be made between Poland and Soviet Russia. The latter

*Poland's  
Peace Terms*

must first surrender all territory east of the "line of 1772," which obtained before the first partition of Poland, and in addition,—

Second. Russia must recognize the independence of all the

States which on the western frontier of Russia, have established de facto governments.

Three. Russia must agree to refrain from any propaganda whatever on territories forming part of the Polish States.

Four. Russia must indemnify Poland for the devastation of lands and industries caused by the over-running of Poland by Russian armies since 1914.

Five. Russia must return to Poland all locomotives and rolling stock, including the thousands of railway carriages taken from Poland by Russia since the beginning of the war in 1914, this rolling stock to be returned in good condition, or the value of such rolling stock in cash.

Six. Russia must indemnify in cash all Poles inhabiting Russian territory whose properties have been destroyed.

Seven. The exchange of war prisoners must be undertaken and the free return to Poland of all emigrants is to take place from the moment of the signing of the armistice.

Eight. Russia will supply trains so that the Polish Army in Siberia may return to Poland, and with the honors of war, with ammunition, arms and food.

Nine. Russia must return to Poland all the archives, the works of art, libraries and collections taken from Poland, from the first invasion of Poland during the first partitioning of the Polish State up to the present time, this applying equally to both public and private collections.

Ten. As a guarantee that Russia will keep these conditions, the Polish Army will occupy the Government of Smolensk, together with the town of Smolensk, from which territory it will withdraw as soon as Russia has fulfilled the last condition of peace with Poland.

Eleven. The peace treaty must be ratified by a duly elected Russian representative Diet.

Poland's demands, if complied with, would give her more territory than the Versailles Treaty awarded her.

On March 23 the Associated Press reported that the Bolsheviks had begun a strong drive against the Polish front. After the greatest artillery preparation yet experienced, the Bolshevik infantry, aided

*Fighting on the  
Polish Front*

by tanks and armored cars, advanced in columns towards the bridgehead at Zwiehel, but the Poles successfully repulsed the attack, and launched an offensive against the Seventh Bolshevik Division in the sector of Emilozen, compelling the Russians to retreat, after abandoning their guns and supplies. A dispatch from Warsaw dated March 26 stated that Bolshevik attacks had been started against the Polish line on a 400-mile front. Kovno, an important railroad center, and Kamenetz-Podolsk, a city of great strategic value, were the objectives of the Bolsheviks. Fierce hand-to-hand fighting took place in villages to the east of the Slutch River, but the Russians were forced to retire, though their attacks were repeatedly renewed. Dispatches from Warsaw, dated March 25, stated that the Bolsheviks, attacking the Polish lines on a 250-mile front, captured several towns along the Slutch River and that fierce artillery and airplane engagements had been taking place without decisive results. According to a communication sent from Warsaw on March 28 the Bolshevik drive has been unsuccessful. In Southern Poland General Denikin is in a bad way, for dispatches of March 28 announced his defeat by the Bolsheviks.



## Eastertide Past and Present

P. W. BROWNE

EASTER occupies first place among Christian festivals; and its *motif* is found in the exultant utterance of St. Paul: "Now is Christ risen" (I Cor. XV, 20). In an earlier part of this same chapter the Apostle of the Gentiles says: "If Christ be not risen again, then vain is our preaching, and your faith also is vain" (I Cor. XV, 14).

The term Easter is found only among Teutonic peoples; for all other branches of the human family designate the great feast by some modification of the Hebrew-Greek word, *pascha*. Hence the French *pâques*, the Italian *pasqua*, the Spanish *pascua*. In Spain and in Italy the term is used to denote a "solemnity," and it is extended to other feasts, e. g., the Spanish name for Palm Sunday, *Pascua Florida*, and Christmas is termed *Pascua de la Natividad*. In certain parts of France First Communion is known as *pâques*, whatever time of the year it is administered.

Pasch is the Aramaic form of the Hebrew word *pesach*, "the passing," or passover. This solemnity was instituted to commemorate the deliverance of the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt, and it was celebrated on the fourteenth of Nisan, the first month of the Jewish year. The institution is thus recorded: "It is the victim of the passage of the Lord, when He passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, striking the Egyptians, and saving our houses" (Exod. XII, 27). As a typical institution its object was to shadow forth the great facts and consequences of the Christian Sacrifice: "Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened. For Christ our Pasch is sacrificed" (I Cor. V, 7).

The origin of the word Easter is uncertain; it is to be noted that it, and not the Biblical term pasch, has been adopted by the Germanic races. Some writers claim that Easter is derived from the German *osatra* which signifies "a rising;" while others, among whom is Venerable Bede, contend that Easter is simply the Saxon word *eostre* (an old Saxon goddess), and that the month of April was dedicated to her and was known as *Eostre-monath*. According to the Edda, an Icelandic Saga, this deity was the goddess of dawn, who opened the rosy portals of Valhalla to receive Baldur, the sun-god, whose brow supplied mankind with light. Grimm calls this goddess *Osatra* "divinity of the radiant dawn, of upspringing light." This word is also the progenitor of our word East, "where the sun rises."

We cannot accurately determine the date of the institution of Easter as a Christian festival, though it was celebrated in the early days of Christianity. Two modes of celebrating the festival were in vogue; and Apostolic precedent was claimed for both. The Western Church

(Rome) celebrated Easter on the Sunday after fourteenth Nisan, i. e. the Sunday following the first full moon after the vernal equinox, as it was on this day that Christ rose from the dead and completed the work of our redemption. This, it is claimed, was the practice of Sts. Peter and Paul. The Eastern Church (Antioch) celebrated Easter on the day of the Jewish Passover, fourteenth Nisan, regardless of the day of the week on which it fell, and it invoked the authority of St. John in justification. Those who followed this custom were known as *Quartodecimani*, "fourteenth-dayers." Out of the difference in the time of celebration arose the "Paschal Controversies" which continued till the Council of Nicea (325) decreed that Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday immediately following the fourteenth day of the so-called paschal moon, which occurs on, or after, the vernal equinox. This falls on March 21; so that the earliest date on which Easter can occur is March 22; the latest, on April 22.

From the earliest days Easter has been celebrated with the greatest possible solemnity. Previous to the thirteenth century every day of Easter Week was kept as a holiday of obligation. Eastertide was preceded by a time of fasting, as it still is, and the fast ended with cock-crow on Easter morn. The fast now ends at mid-day on Holy Saturday. This day was set apart as a special time for the baptism of catechumens; and the feast itself was a day of universal rejoicing. Gregory of Nazianzen calls it "the royal day amongst days"; and St. Leo terms it "the feast of feasts."

The early Christian Emperors signalized Eastertide by setting minor criminals at liberty. All public spectacles were prohibited; and by a decree of the Council of Orleans the Jews were forbidden to assemble in public thoroughfares, or mingle with Christians, lest the festive joys of the latter should be marred. In later times, St. Peter's, in Rome, was brilliantly illuminated; and at mid-day, on Easter Sunday, the Pope, from the balcony above the vestibule, pronounced a blessing upon the world.

The liturgical observances of the Church at Eastertide are most impressive, and of course symbolic. Chief amongst these is the Paschal Candle which is solemnly blessed on Holy Saturday. This signifies Christ "The Light of the World," and it is lighted during the singing of the "*Exultet*," the most beautiful specimen of Gregorian hymnology in the service of the Church. The authorship of this is ascribed to St. Augustine. As he was said to be a deacon when he composed it, the "*Exultet*" usually is sung by the deacon of the Holy Saturday Office.

The Paschal Candle is composed of pure beeswax. In this, symbolism recognizes the most pure flesh which

Christ derived from His blessed Mother, in the wick, the human soul of Christ, and in the flame, the Divinity of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. By the five grains of incense which are set cross-wise in the candle during the singing of the "*Exultet*" the Five Wounds of Christ are suggested; whilst the lighting of the Candle with new fire serves as a lively image of the Resurrection.

In England during the "Ages of Faith" the Paschal Candle was of colossal dimensions, and the Sarum Processional of 1517 directs that the Paschal Candle, presumably that of Salisbury Cathedral, is to be thirty-six feet in height. In 1558, we are told, 300 weight of wax was used for the Paschal Candle of Westminster Abbey. It was customary after the close of the Paschal time to melt down the remains of the candle for tapers to be used gratuitously at the funerals of the poor. At Rome the remains of the candle were converted into Agnus Deis.

Closely associated with the Paschal Candle is the "Holy Fire." The lighting of fire at Eastertide is a very ancient custom, and antedates Christianity. All the religious beliefs of antiquity accorded a prominent place to this element whose mysterious nature and irresistible power frequently caused it to be adored as a god. Christianity adopted it as a symbol of the Divinity of Christ. The new fire which begins the ceremony of Holy Saturday is struck from a flint and is blessed by the officiating priest. After the ceremony the Faithful take the charred remains to their homes, and it is, or used to be, a custom to light the Easter morning fire with a "blessed brand." There are still in existence some of the old contrivances used for the lighting of the sacred fire, known as "cresets," of which several specimens may still be seen at the Abbeys of Furness and Caldey.

No festival has so many traditions, beliefs and customs attached to it as Easter. Some of these have a distinctly religious suggestiveness, while others are redolent of superstition.

A custom that was in vogue at the close of the Middle Ages was that known as the "hallowing" of food to be used on Easter Day, and the blessing of the firstlings of the sheepfold. The lambs were blessed either at the door of the church or in the home. This custom is perpetuated in the Easter observances of certain religious communities, where, on Easter Sunday, a lamb, set upon a huge platter, surmounted by a small banner, a red cross on a white field, is placed in the center of the refectory table. After the meal whatever is left of the lamb, is cast into the fire.

In medieval times there were certain sports and pastimes which were performed under the patronage of the ecclesiastical authorities. The most singular of these was the playing of hand-ball in churches. The Church dignitaries participated in the game, and the laity were not excluded. This performance was regarded as being symbolic of the supposed triple bounding of the sun on Easter

morn to make amends for the three days of darkness during Our Lord's entombment.

Another very peculiar form of ecclesiastical gaiety existed in France, even as late as the sixteenth century. At Puy it was customary, when at the first psalm of Matins a canon happened to be absent from the choir, for some of the other canons and vicars to go to the domicile of the absentee with processional cross and holy water, sing the "*Haec Dies*," and rouse the somnolent official from his slumbers, after a copious sprinkling. The slothful canon was then led back to the church where he assisted at the remainder of the office. In punishment for his delinquency, the good canon was obliged to furnish a breakfast to all who had participated in the procession. Similar customs existed at Nantes and Angers; but they were prohibited by diocesan councils in 1431 and 1448.

The most widely-observed popular custom associated with Easter is egg-giving. In olden times Easter eggs were blessed for the Faithful and a special form of blessing was authorized by Pope Paul V. The eggs presented for the blessing were colored red, as this was the color which symbolized the blood of the Redeemer. It was a belief held by some pious souls that eggs laid on Good Friday had a special blessing attached to them, and that whosoever ate them as his first food on Easter, received a token of prosperity. Another custom in which the egg featured was that known as the *Ovadium*. This was simply the paying of the tithes due for the pastoral services of the priest. It may be said in this connection that the payment of tithes "in kind" is neither an obsolete custom nor is it an indication of poverty on the part of the parishoners. Those who are familiar with the history of Canada and the Dominion of Newfoundland know the meaning of payments of this nature.

Some piously disposed writers contend that the Easter egg-giving and the egg-eating customs are of Christian origin. Sober history tells us that long before the Christian era such customs were in vogue. Myths regarding the Easter egg are very numerous, and we find them in the records of ancient Egyptians, Persians, Greeks, Gauls, and Romans, as well as in the Sagas of the Northland. According to these old traditions, the egg was a symbol of immortality. In it life lay dormant; but under the influence of a deity it might become a sensate and living being.

A writer on Eastern traditions (Bellew), tells us that in ancient Persia, centuries before the Christian era, the people were worshipers of fire. According to their belief there was a great spirit that existed from eternity; and from him came the first light. From this came two brothers, Ormuzd and Ahriman. Ahriman grew jealous of his elder brother, and was condemned by the great spirit to pass three thousand years in utter darkness. On his return from his dark abode, Ahriman created a number of evil spirits to oppose the good spirits created by Ormuzd; and when the latter created an egg contain-



ing good genii, Ahriman formed another full of evil spirits and broke the two together, so that the good and the evil genii became mixed in the new creation.

Within recent years many of the "eggs" circulated at Easter time are not the product of the gallinaceous tribe; they are manufactured. The industry is a very extensive business enterprise; and in many of the European cities, before the war, of course, and even in America, the *bon-bon* egg was quite common. Russia took the lead in the manufacturing of "eggs;" but those were not edible, as they were made of glass and intended for ornamental purposes only. Many of the Russian glass plants made a specialty of this business; and costly specimens were produced for the Czar and his family. Presumably this industry is not operative at the moment.

Easter is pre-eminently the feast of flowers, as Christmas is the feast of evergreens. Formerly in England the special Easter flower was the lavender, *lavendula spicula*, whose flowers have a highly aromatic odor and a bitterish taste, suggestive of the spices which the holy women brought to the tomb of Our Lord on the first Easter morn: "And when the Sabbath was passed, Mary Magdalen, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, brought sweet spices, that coming, they might anoint Jesus" (Mark XVI, 1). Church walls were festooned with this symbolic plant, while garlands of roses were placed upon the altars and the statuary and crosses trimmed with the same trophies of the garden were distributed among the Faithful, as symbols of the Resurrection.

## Industrial Democracy Through Law

A. J. MUENCH

THE struggle over political questions, national and international, so much engaged the thoughts of men in recent weeks, that they scarcely took notice of some very important legislation, which may yet exert a profound influence upon the world. It is legislation making industrial democracy a fact of law. We have been accustomed to hear of Whitley councils, Harvester councils, Leitch governmental systems, Rockefellerian plans, shop committees, and so forth, as expressions of industrial democracy. These all are voluntary arrangements between employers and employees, a sort of armistice agreed upon between militant capital and militant labor. They have not behind them the sanction of law, as have the workmen's councils of Germany just recently enacted into law.

By their new constitution workers in the German Republic are henceforth assured, not only political democracy, but also industrial democracy. They are to obtain this industrial democracy through workmen's councils as the organs through which it is to function. Born from Russian Sovietism, these councils have developed a spirit so different from the Bolshevik sire that they are now disowned by it. The workmen's councils of Russia go back as far as the revolution of 1905. They were formed at this time because every other kind of labor organization was lacking to give expression to the aspirations of the workers. There was no labor party, no trade-unionism, no federation of labor worth speaking of. Even after the establishment of these workmen's councils in 1905, no move was made to bring them into one compact organization. Whilst originating in a period of revolution, they were not revolutionary in character. It is true they were characterized by certain Socialist tendencies, yet on the whole they were democratically organized.

self-governing bodies without constituting a one-class rule. Under Kerensky they existed side by side with the political government, and only with the overthrow of his regime did they develop into political organs of Bolshevism. With the ascendancy of Lenine and Trotzky they developed into the instruments of a one-class government, as expressed in the dictatorship of the proletariat. From this time on they have been the tools of Bolshevism.

The workmen's councils in Germany began where the Russian councils left off, that is, they were started in their most radical form. This was due to the fact that, when the Government tottered in the revolution of November, 1918, sane political thought was pushed into the background, loud-mouthed radical agitators came to the fore, and immediately proclaimed a form of government after the pattern of Lenine. But political groups soon steadied themselves. One month afterward, when on December 16, the first Soviet Congress of Workmen's and Soldier's Councils was convened in Berlin, the pressure upon the radical forces by sane political opinion became so great that this Congress was obliged to send out an early call for the elections to the National Assembly, whose principal object was to give to the German people a democratic form of government. These elections were held on January 19, 1919, and returned a coalition government, much to the surprise of the agitators of the Lenine stripe, composed principally of the Spartacus group under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. These radicals felt little love for the Majority Socialists, and still less for the Catholic Center party, who formed the principal block of the new coalition Government. This coalition Government was pledged to political and industrial democracy, and with

respect to the latter it issued a statement from Weimar, March 1, 1919, in these words:

We will create the organs of industrial democracy, namely workmen's councils, constituted upon the principle that they shall proceed from the free choice of the representatives of all workers. We shall reach the goal of industrial democracy through the constitutional factory upon a democratic basis.

A few months later, in the last days of July, five years almost to the day that the world struggle began over the question whether autocracy or democracy shall rule, article 165 providing for industrial democracy through the organization of workmen's councils, was placed into the new German Constitution as one of its most important cornerstones. It is with reference to this that Dr. David said in his speech on the day the National Assembly at Weimar accepted the Constitution: "The German Republic is henceforth the most democratic democracy in the world."

The law enforcing the constitutional clause provides for a council of workmen in every industrial plant or establishment having more than twenty workers. Shops with less than twenty and at least five workers are entitled to a steward, who is the official spokesman of labor. The members of the councils are elected for a term of one year by secret ballot, in an open assembly of all the workers, those eighteen years of age being entitled to a vote. The members of the councils must be German citizens, twenty years of age, and employees for at least a half a year in the establishment where the council is to be formed. There must be at least three members in the council and no more than forty: where a council is composed of more than three members an executive committee is chosen from among their number. The councils of all industrial plants in a certain district or region are again represented in district or regional councils; and the regional councils are in turn subordinated to the national council, the highest council in the land. Shop councils are integrated into the administrative boards of the larger regional and national councils. There is, therefore, a hierarchical organization of councils, much like that of the Whitley councils in England. These latter, however, are not compulsory, but only voluntary councils; so far about fifty industries have established them, and these are rather minor industries with the exception of the building and textile industries, two of the largest in England; they represent only 2,500,000 workers. In Germany the councils are compelled by law, and must therefore, affect every industry whether large or small. There is still another very important difference to be noted between the Whitley councils and the German workmen's councils. The former are joint councils in which both the employer and the employee are represented; the latter are councils of employees only. In these councils every kind of labor, manual or intellectual, skilled or unskilled, of whatever craft or trade is represented, so that the regional and especially the national councils become labor parliaments, representing every

group of labor in the land. To offset any overbalance of power of labor, definite restrictions have been placed upon the jurisdiction of these councils. They have only advisory powers, exercising no control over executive decisions of the management of a plant; they have no voice whatsoever in the employment of workmen, and none as regards their dismissal, excepting in so far as they may demand, upon the appeal of the dismissed workman, a hearing of his case; they are given no supervision of the financial books, the right being merely conceded them to see the statistical wage reports and the profit and loss accounts at the end of a year; credit transactions are not open for inspection. As a further balance to a possible overweighted labor power there are organized besides the regional workmen's councils regional industrial councils, and besides the national workmen's council a national industrial council.

These councils, regional and national, are composed of both employers and employees; they represent industry as a whole and not only one of its parts. They may initiate legislation, and may demand participation in the consideration of all questions respecting economic or industrial legislation; they enjoy executive functions in issuing special regulations according to the general legislative standards as embodied in the law, functions, therefore, not unlike those possessed by a number of industrial commissions in the United States, notably those of New York and Wisconsin. The purpose of these industrial councils is to rationalize the methods and processes of production by removing haphazardness; to obtain collaboration of capital and labor for an increased production. The organization of these industrial councils is already well under way, as is attested by the fact that the Government, besides sending to London its *chargé d'affaires* in political questions, sent with him also a representative of the national industrial council, Mr. Dufour-Feronce, to take in hand industrial and commercial relations between Germany and England. This is so much the more worthy of note, since it is perhaps the first time in the history of modern governments, that a nation is officially represented by one whose business is not political, but directly industrial and commercial.

The bill providing for these workmen's councils found little favor with the Socialists of Bolshevik tendencies. At the time when the bill came up in the National Assembly for its second and third reading in the middle of January of this year, their organ, "*Die Freiheit*," called it a dastardly fraud which will once for all kill all thoughts of a social revolution." On the afternoon of the thirteenth, the Independent Socialists, the Communists and the Spartacides held huge demonstrations of protest in Berlin against the passage of the enforcement law, marching with placards and red flags to the parliamentary building. The military police having been advised of the serious intents of these revolutionists, protected the approaches to the building with fixed bayonets and machine guns. Attacked by the Reds, the



police made use of weapons with the result that forty-two persons were killed and one hundred and five wounded in the skirmish. Upon the order of the Minister of Defense, Noske, martial law was declared for practically the whole of Germany, some southern sections and the occupied zones excepted. The bill became a law in a special Sunday session, quite unusual, January 18, 1920, by a vote of 513 against 64.

The fact that these workmen's councils developed into safe, social measures of reform, after commencing as Soviet types, is due in no small measure to the activities of the Catholic Center party, which held its own against the reactionary Nationalists on the right and the radical Socialists on the left. As the law now stands, it respects the rights of property as against its confiscation; the councils are based, not on the dictatorship of one class, but on a proportional representation of all classes; they do not serve as tools of class warfare, but as organs of industrial peace. In no sense can they be compared to the Bolshevik Soviet system of Russia. The Rev. Henry Pesch, S. J., sees in these councils an expression of "a truly democratic idea of solidarism." It is freely said that the presence of this distinguished authority in social economics, in the vicinity of Berlin, during the critical days of the discussion of the special provisions of this bill, was not fortuitous. Schools under Catholic auspices, providing courses for workmen, so that they may approach their tasks efficiently and fulfil their duties in the councils adequately, have already been opened in various parts of Germany.

At this time it is difficult to say whether this institution of industrial democracy by law will have the beneficial results which are claimed for it. The future is more than ever dark and uncertain. However, the experiment has commenced, and labor the world over will undoubtedly watch it with eager interest.

## Education and the Rampart of Freedom

JOHN C. REVILLE, S.J.

**I**N the introduction to the thirteenth volume of his "History of the German People," Janssen paints the degradation of German literature from the outbreak of the Reformation to the beginning of the Thirty Years' War. In a few bold strokes he shows how all sense of beauty had disappeared, and all feeling for "simple loveliness of expression" had been lost. The popular drama had sunk to the "deepest mire of degradation"; popular romances of the most immoral kind poisoned the minds of the people.

Narrative literature lent itself wholly to the service of the preposterous and absurd, to nightmares of superstition, witchcraft and demonology, in which the devil was always a favorite figure. Satan, indeed at that period played a leading part on the stage of the world and humanity. He reigned supreme in life and fiction.

This deterioration of the national literature, adds the

historian, is chiefly responsible for the verdict often passed on the closing period of the Middle Ages,—that they were days of intellectual decay, and that the Church of Rome was more or less answerable for the "tremendous bankruptcy of German national life."

Yet the period thus condemned for its barrenness was one of vigorous intellectual activity. The pursuit of knowledge was not confined to the cabinet of the scholar. Through the schools it permeated the masses of the people. In the words of Janssen, "a deeply-Christian theory of life" dominated masters and students alike; men, for instance, like Alexander Hegius of Wesel, a practical educator, whose cardinal principle was that true intellectual culture is bound up with devotion to Christ; men like Rudolph von Langen and Mummellius of Munster, whose schools attracted scholars from far and wide. The period so decried was the age of Jacob Wimpheling, whose pedagogical treatises were known throughout Germany; of Geiler von Kaisersberg, popular orator of Strassburg; of Zasius, the jurist; of Johann Müller and Nicholas de Cusa, pioneers of modern astronomical science; of Johann von Dalberg, the Mæcenas of his day. It was the age of flourishing schools like those of Zwickau, which in 1490 had 900 pupils; of Emmerich, on the Lower Rhine, with 1500 in 1521; of Schlettstadt, developed under Ludwig Dringenburg, whose scholars in 1517 amounted to 900."

But the Lutheran agitation, turmoil in the State, the controversies and polemics that followed the revolt of the Wittenberg doctor, the quarrels that divided Germany after the apostate had set prince against prince, and roused the peasants against their masters, soon destroyed the work of the preceding years. The words of Erasmus were verified: "Where Lutheranism reigns, letters decay and die." In his manifesto of 1524, to the burgomasters and town-councilors of Germany, Luther complained that the schools were everywhere in decay. Five years later he wrote that town-councils and municipal authorities allowed the schools to go to ruin. In the famous sermon of 1530, to the children, the same charge is made. Since individuals and his own Church were so negligent, in order to refill the deserted classrooms, he advised the "Turkish custom of compulsory attendance." He thus abdicated the rights of the family and the Church into the hands of the State. If rulers, Luther argued, can compel their subjects to carry the spear and musket and go to war, "how much more are they bound to compel them to send their children to school." As yet the theory of a State monopoly of education was not fully developed, but with Luther's views of the omnipotence of the commonwealth firmly held by the Reformer and his followers, that conclusion was not far off. As far back as 1521, the apostate, John Ebelin de Gunzburg, had asserted that the State should be charged with the duties of the teacher and that instruction should be obligatory and free. Four years after, Luther writing to the

Elector of Saxony, drew a dark picture of the condition of education throughout Germany, and concluded that unless the Government should organize and support the whole system, there would remain neither scholars nor schools.

But times were not ripe for the full development of the monopolistic ideas outlined by the Reformer. It takes time for a principle to make its way. The theory was helped on greatly by the Regalist School, partisan of the absolutist doctrines so much in favor with the post-Reformation princes, and unfortunately not confined to Protestant countries or Protestant kings. It received an indirect support from the false views laid down in the "Emile" of Rousseau, and reached its climax in the repeated attempt made in France under the First Empire, the Monarchy and the Republic to make the State the sole arbiter of the destinies of the child.

Instances of that policy of autocratic control over higher education at least, may be seen in Spain as far back as 1593. In that year, Philip II made an invidious distinction between academic degrees and titles conferred upon physicians and the professional rights accorded them. The latter, the monarch reserved to his own royal authority. His successor, Philip IV, went further and specified that grammar schools were to be erected in such localities only as he deemed suitable. The order was renewed by Ferdinand VI in 1747. In the erection of his *Colegio Academico* for the advancement of primary teaching, Charles III there centralized all the instrumentalities and powers hitherto allowed full freedom of action and development in the competitive trend of primary education. The *Colegio*, according to its charter, was to take precedence in all things, and transcend every other establishment of its kind in the kingdom. It was to foster the spirit of religion and train children to the exercise of the Christian virtues. The king, moreover, claimed that the functions marked out were one of the most important economic and police duties of the State. Going still further, but this time in the matter of secondary education, Charles III, by a royal decree of 1770, rendered necessary by the exile of the Jesuits, which had completely disorganized the whole scheme of secondary education, outlined one of the most complete programs of State education devised up to that time. The number of professors' chairs was determined, a program was laid down, the minutest officers were appointed. Even the nomination of porters, ushers and caretakers and sweepers became matters of royal deliberation and ruling. The monarch provided and legislated for the literary and spiritual welfare of the pupils, the worthy reception of the Sacraments at stated times, the periods of study, the holidays, the whole scholastic life in a word, both of students and professors. All this was for all intents and purposes a monopoly of education in its secondary branches. His successor, Charles IV, did for the study of medicine what his predecessor had done for secondary

schools. He obliged all medical faculties and colleges to conform to the medical program and requirements of the *Colegio San Carlos* of Madrid, an attempt similar to that of the medical associations in the United States, which, self-appointed guardians of medical standards, and without any authority whatever, classify medical colleges as they see fit and force them to adopt their arbitrary regulations.

But Charles IV witnessed the disastrous effects of State control. So unsatisfactory were the results of the centralizing tendencies of his predecessor, that he abolished the law which made the *Colegio Academico* an educational autocrat. In his royal decree of February 11, 1804, he was obliged, after witnessing the deplorable effects of the attempted monopoly to admit that reason and experience alike, prove the fatal consequences resulting from the restriction of the teacher's functions to a privileged few. These chosen ones, continued the King, enjoy the exclusive title and honors of teacher and professor. They deprive others, distinguished by their virtues and learning, of the right to teach and thus to reap the fruit of their labor. They prevent many from following that vocation to which their inclinations and their talents call them, they debar the public from the benefits produced in all the branches of the State by honorable rivalry and competition, and force it to make use of the services of men who, sure of position and employment, do little to equip themselves more thoroughly for their duties. Seldom, we think, have the evils of a State monopoly of education been so forcibly expressed. The words of the royal critic deserve still more weight when we remember that he had once been the champion of the system which he was now obliged to condemn. (Ruiz Amado's "*La Leyenda del Estado Enseñante*," Cap. x, p., 119.ss).

Everywhere, tyrants and autocrats see in the control of education by the State, an instrument for the furthering of their high-handed plans. While in Spain the Bourbons used it for their ambitious designs, the Hapsburgs in Austria were following the same dangerous policy. Emperor Joseph II, "my brother, the sacristan," as Frederick the Great used to call him, absolutely enslaved education. Its primary and higher branches were under his complete control. The universities, the seminaries, were degraded into mere instruments of the police power of the Empire. Professors, courses, programs, text-books, vacations, examinations, degrees, all were regulated by imperial decree. Professors were State officials; and in seminaries supposed to teach Catholic doctrines and to train the future priests of his Apostolic Majesty, the Emperor of Austria, Jansenists, and unbelievers held chairs of dogmatic and moral theology. The State had turned teacher, and it taught as it liked and only such doctrines as were calculated to make its pupils its pliant tools. And, indeed, States have never followed any other program.



## The British Labor Party

HENRY SOMERVILLE

THE Labor party is now indisputably the second of the great parties in England, the chief Opposition party and the party that will assume office if the present Coalition Government is turned out. The Liberal party is now a poor third with no chance of supremacy in the country or the House of Commons. The old Unionist or Conservative party, commonly called Tory, would of itself be no more able than the Liberal to obtain a popular or a parliamentary majority. Of the three parties, Labor is the first in the country, and can get more votes than either of the other parties. Only by means of a coalition between the Conservatives and the majority of Liberals can Labor be kept out.

A Labor Government in England as a result of the next general election is more than a possibility. A statement of what manner of party the Labor party is, may be of interest. One question is whether the Labor party is Socialist. This is a question that has been debated with some keenness among Catholics in England. According to its constitution, the chief objects of Labor are to secure to the producers by hand and brain the full fruits of their industry *upon the basis of the common ownership of the means of production*. This brings the Labor party, as its architect, Mr. Sidney Webb, says, "under the general designation of Socialist." But Mr. Webb immediately adds: "It is a Socialism which is no more specific than a definite repudiation of the individualism that characterized all the political parties of the past generation." He explains that co-operative societies represent common ownership within the sense of the Labor party constitution.

Labor refuses to call itself Socialist, and forbids its candidates to describe themselves as Socialist candidates, although the Socialist societies affiliated to it have long agitated for the liberty of candidates to use the Socialist name. The majority of the leaders of the Labor party might profess a personal belief in Socialism, a cautious, ambiguous Socialism, however, like that which treats co-operative societies as forms of common ownership.

The immediate practical proposals of the Labor party are not Socialistic, though inclining strongly to the extension of State ownership. The nationalization of the mines is being made the chief issue between the Government and the Labor party, and will be fought out at the next election. Yet there is nothing confiscatory in the means proposed by the party for acquiring the mines. Their spokesmen in Parliament last week said they were prepared to be not only just but generous to the private owners and they were willing to allow the purchase price to be settled by an independent commission. Conservatism is apparent in every item of the party's program. It did not declare itself against the Government's policy of fighting the Bolsheviks until it was clear that the

Bolsheviks had won and that the Government itself wanted to withdraw from Russia. The party has not yet declared its mind on Ireland. It favors "self-determination" for Ireland, but with the qualification of "within the Empire." However, the Labor party has not tied the Ulster millstone round its neck, and it has cleaner hands than the Liberals or the Conservatives. Labor has certainly no reason to be immoderately tender to Belfast.

In short, the Labor party has all the qualities and defects of a strictly "moderate" party. It is moderate of set policy because it appeals for the support of the middle classes, and, as recent by-elections show, is getting it. But, fundamentally, it is moderate because of the personnel of its governing men. These are much of the type of Mr. Gompers, without Mr. Gompers' individuality. The party gets nearly all its funds from the great trade unions, and consequently, such officials as the presidents and secretaries of the unions get themselves nominated for parliamentary candidatures. By the time a man is secretary or president of a trade union he is no longer young or enthusiastic. He has gone through a long and sobering discipline; he has had experience of administration and responsibility; he knows the apathy of the mass of the workers; he has negotiated with employers and understands their point of view; he has children whom he is educating for a better position in life than his own. Consequently, the trade union official who becomes a Labor M. P. is usually the very type of narrow common-sense and safety-first conservatism. A large proportion of our Labor M. P.'s have been, and are, Methodist preachers. Many of them belonged to the Liberal party until late in life; most of them were Liberal-Labor until the last election. A less revolutionary set of men it would be hard to find.

As a result of the astute management of Mr. Sidney Webb, the Labor party now appeals to all "workers by hand or brain," which includes pretty nearly everybody. A large number of brain-workers, particularly lawyers, have been crowding into the party since it has come within sight of the sweets of office. The very growth of Labor produces a change in its composition and therefore, in the character of its policy. It includes sections and classes of different and divergent interests. It cannot make the simple Marxian division of society into proletariat and bourgeoisie and it finds itself forced to a policy of compromise and moderation.

The best brains of the party, it cannot be denied, have hitherto been those of the Socialist "intellectuals" and not the trade union officials. Most of the Socialists, notably Philip Snowden and Ramsey MacDonald, lost their seats at the last parliamentary election because of their pacifism. Owing to the hostility of the trade union element, Snowden and MacDonald have not been given an opportunity of contesting by-elections. There is more friction in the party over the middle-class recruits, who

are now coming in and who are getting nominated as parliamentary candidates by offering to pay their own election expenses. This is bitterly commented upon by an influential Labor organ, the *Labor Leader*, which says:

All sorts and conditions of men are joining the Labor party. It is becoming a refuge for disappointed politicians, for disgruntled public servants, and for ambitious place hunters. Men who have never been heard of in the Socialist or Labor movement are being adopted as Labor parliamentary candidates after a day or two's membership of the party.... It is bad enough for a wealthy trade union to bribe a local Labor party to accept an incompetent candidate by relieving it of all financial effort, but it is infinitely worse to sell the seat to a political nonentity who offers to pay all the expenses.

The article from which I have taken the above extract is headed "Too Much Success." There are lamentations that the Labor party is losing its idealism while it is gaining in inclusiveness. The men and the measures associated with Labor in these, its prosperous days, are violently exciting neither hopes nor fears. There is no threat of a revolution or promise of a millennium.

### America's Policy Toward Ireland

WILLIAM J. M. A. MALONEY, M. D.

**I**MPELLING Congress to action, in recognition of the Irish Republic, were innumerable petitions, including the *Irish World* petition with the signatures of 600,000 American citizens. Resolutions passed by mass meetings had flowed to Congress from all parts of the country in a ceaseless stream. State assemblies and boards of aldermen; learned, commercial, industrial, and philanthropic associations; labor conventions, and other authoritative gatherings of special popular interests, all had urged official action on behalf of the independence of Ireland. Since the American people themselves became free, no such imperative demand had ever arisen from them for the recognition of any new nation, as that which required the recognition of the Irish Republic. Moreover, England in accepting the armistice terms of the fourteen points and the subsequent discourses, had accepted in principle the independence of the Irish Republic. In requesting that England should make good her acceptance, Congress was merely fulfilling its duty to the American people. There was no thought of injustice or of hostility to England. The United States had just saved England from military disaster, had destroyed England's greatest naval and commercial rival, and had victoriously associated with England in a war both to end war, and to free small nations. It was a period of intensive and obligatory adulation in America of the British and their institutions. Such was the honor in which England was held here that American was almost synonymous with Anglo-American or British-American. The recognition of Irish independence by Congress was, therefore, neither anti-English, nor even dominantly pro-Irish, but rather an expression of the sincere passion for "that national liberty which God has

conferred on man," and which the American people had so nobly vindicated in the late war.

President Wilson was doubtless immediately informed through the proper administrative channels, of the completion by Congress, on June 6, 1919, of the recognition of the Irish Republic. On June 11, 1919, Mr. Frank P. Walsh, chairman of the American Commission on Irish Independence, at Paris, called the attention of Mr. Wilson to the earnest request of Congress for intervention by the American peace plenipotentiaries on behalf of the newly recognized State. According to Mr. Walsh (Evidence before the Senate Committee, at the Peace Treaty Hearing, August 30, 1919), the President stated the grounds on which he denied Ireland's right to recognition; and continuing said:

That is an official request, Mr. Walsh. Of course you should understand that no small nation of any kind has yet appeared before the Committee of Four, and there is an agreement among the Committee of Four that none can come unless unanimous consent is given by the whole Committee.

The unanimous consent agreement empowered Britain to veto the American request, with the connivance of Mr. Wilson, who was party to the vetoing agreement, and in sympathy with its application to the Irish claim.

Indeed, from the conduct of Mr. Wilson, and from the whisperings of his intimates, and from the official American policy towards the Irish Republic, and from the hints of Lieutenant A. A. Berle of the Secretariat of the American Peace Commission (the *Nation*, New York, p. 170, August 9, 1919), and from the specific statement of the Anglo-American liaison officer, Sir Horace Plunkett (Editorial, *Irish Statesman*, 1919, no. 1, col. 1, p. 2), the conclusion is inescapable that America's Executive even entered into a secret understanding with Mr. Lloyd George to compromise, on the basis of colonial government, Ireland's claim to complete sovereignty. The successor of the Monroe who refused to partake of any council whose object was not the complete independence of the Spanish Republics conceded to English usurpation the sovereignty of the Irish Republic which Congress had just recognized.

Under analogous circumstances, on December 19, 1864, when America's Executive deprecated to the French Government a resolution of Congress concerning Maximilian's usurpation in Mexico, the House of Representatives passed the following resolution:

That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States, as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters; and it is the constitutional duty of the Executive to respect that policy not less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national forces when authorized by law; and the propriety of any declaration of foreign policy by Congress is sufficiently proved by the vote which pronounces it; and such proposition while pending and undetermined is not a fit topic of diplomatic explanation with any foreign power.

President Wilson's reaction to the Congressional resolution intervening at the Peace Conference in favor of the Irish Republic, has hitherto evoked neither challenge



nor comment from Congress. If it be not merely a vestigial remnant of constitutional development towards absolutism, if dignity still survive in it, even without authority, Congress must at least seek information concerning the Presidential response to its earnest request. A call for papers seems already overdue.

In all democratic countries the legislative is the supreme branch of the Government. To it all power is delegated by those who consent to be governed; and from them all power is originally derived. Congress, therefore, when it officially requested a hearing before the nations assembled at the Peace Conference for the delegates chosen by the Irish Republic to present its claim there, intervened on behalf of the Irish Republic with all the moral force of the American people. And the sole response of England was to intensify the reign of terror in the Irish Republic: to raise the weekly average number of British outrages to 2800 (*The Nation*, New York, January 31, 1920); to suppress the Irish Congress; to destroy and pillage parts of the cities of Cork and Londonderry; to sack the town of Thurles; to deport and imprison the Lord Mayor of Dublin, as the Germans deported and imprisoned Mayor Max of Brussels; and to murder Mayor MacCurtain of Cork.

The attitude of the President and England raises the constitutional question of the force and validity of the recognition of the Irish Republic by the legislative branches of the United States Government. Most acts of recognition concern merely new governments, not new States. The policy of this country towards a preexisting State, being already established, the Jefferson maxim applies:

Every nation has a right to govern itself internally under what form it chooses and to change that form at its own will; and to transact business with other nations through whatever organ it chooses, whether that be king, convention, assembly, committee, president, or whatever it be. The only thing essential is the will of the people. ("Jefferson's Works," Washington Edition, Vol. III, p. 500).

The recognition of the changing organ of government is thus a purely formal act of executive authority. Congress is not concerned in it. The President or his appointees uniformly perform it. Hence, we find President Pierce giving recognition to five successive governments in Mexico during as many months; Rush, the United States representative in Paris, on his own initiative, recognizing the French Republic of 1848, three days after it was proclaimed; and even a United States representative, Crawford, armed for every emergency with blank credentials.

But it is equally established that the recognition of the contested independence of a new State is beyond the constitutional authority of the President and resides in Congress. Monroe seeking information on this point addressed the following memorandum to his Cabinet:

Has the Executive power to acknowledge the independence of new States whose independence has not been acknowledged by the parent State, and between which parties a war actually

exists on that account? Will the sending or receiving a minister be considered an acknowledgment of its independence? Is such an acknowledgment a justifiable cause of war to the parent country? (Writings, Vol. 6, p. 31.)

Monroe was evidently informed that he had not the power; for when Congress had reached the point of forcing upon him the recognition of the South American Republics, he submitted himself to the authority of Congress in a message in which he said: "Should Congress concur in the view herein presented they will doubtless see the propriety of making the necessary appropriations for carrying it into effect" (*"Annals of Congress,"* p. 1238). Congress appropriated \$100,000; ministers were sent to the new State and Spain answered Monroe's third query in the negative.

President Jackson when compelled by Congress to recognize the independence of Texas, stated in a special message:

Nor has any deliberative inquiry ever been instituted in Congress or any of our legislative bodies as to whom belonged the power the exercise of which is equivalent, under some circumstances, to a declaration of war, a power nowhere expressly delegated and only granted in the Constitution as it is necessarily involved in some of the great powers given to Congress: in that given to the President and Senate to form treaties with foreign powers, and to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers; and in that conferred upon the President to receive ministers from foreign nations. It will always be consistent with the spirit of the Constitution and most safe that it (the power of recognition) should be exercised when probably leading to war, with a previous understanding with that body by whom war can alone be declared, and by whom all the provisions for sustaining its perils must be furnished.

Finally, Jackson accepted the authority of Congress, stating that he doubted the power of the President to recognize Texas, and would immediately concur if the majority recommended it (*"Texas Diplomatic Correspondence,"* Vol. I, p. 171). The Senate by resolution (March 11, 1837), acknowledged the independence of Texas and defeated an amendment to give the President discretionary powers. The House of Representatives subsequently passed a like resolution, but gave the President discretionary powers, and voted money to defray the expenses of the United States Minister to Texas. And the recognition of Texas was complete.

In 1864, in response to an assertion that the President considered the power of recognition to be a purely executive one, within the competence of the Executive alone, a House Report (No. 129, 38th Congress, 1 Sess. p. 1, *et seq.*) was adopted which stated:

This assumption is equally novel and inadmissible. No President has ever claimed such extensive authority. No Congress can ever permit its expression to pass without dissent. It is certain that the Constitution nowhere confers such authority upon the President. . . . It is not known that hitherto the President has ever undertaken to recognize a new nation or a new power not before known in the history of the world and not before acknowledged by the United States, without the previous authority of Congress.

With the unprecedented exception of Panama (in which Roosevelt recognized the State of his own im-

perial creation) the power to recognize a new State, especially when war existed between it and the parties opposing its independence, has been uniformly and constitutionally exercised by Congress (see Davis Report, 1874, on Constitutional Right of Congress to Recognize a Foreign State: and Rawle, second ed. pp. 195-6). Dictatorial executives have tended to usurp the power of Congress, and obstinate executives, to resist it; but the power, nevertheless, resided in Congress and still resides there.

It is, therefore, indisputable that Congress in recognizing the independence of the Irish Republic legitimately exercised its constitutional authority. No power vested in him by the Constitution privileged the Executive to ignore the authority of Congress. When President Wilson publicly refused to sustain at the Peace Conference the action of Congress on the Irish claim, he denied Congressional authority before the democracy of the world, and he refused to recognize not merely the Irish Republic but even the American Constitution.

In a laudable attempt to sustain the prerogative of Congress against encroachment by the Executive, Congressman Mason has introduced a bill, making an appropriation to cover the cost of a United States minister to the Irish Republic: And those who in the coming elections again seek the people's suffrage can offer no more conclusive evidence of their fitness to represent America's citizens than their record in dealing with this measure.

The conduct of the President and England could not affect the validity of the recognition of the Irish Republic by Congress. Neither Mr. Wilson's disregard of his constitutional limitations, nor the contempt of England for Congressional authority could undo a legislative act of the United States Congress. That act, however, might be safely ignored by those who have ignored it, only on three presumptions: (1) that Congress in response to electoral exigencies was making merely a perfunctory and insincere gesture which would not be renewed, and need not be respected; (2) that England could suppress the Irish Republic and would substitute for it the agreed form of colonial government; and (3) that the American people would acquiesce both in the flouting of Congress and in the perpetuation of English misrule in Ireland. These presumptions are the basis of American official policy, which is in essence the policy pursued by the Wilson Administration during the Great War and which now continues sixteen months after the armistice removes even such justification as that war for the freedom of small nations was made to afford. The continuance of this policy is rendered possible by the anti-Irish propaganda, which the war power of the Administration made obligatory, and which the forces that control and support that Administration still make obligatory to a large section of the American press. The American official policy is popularly supposed to be non-intervention. In principle and in fact it is a policy of active pro-English intervention. It denies the existence

of the Irish Republic before the American people. It ignores or conceals the British atrocities in Ireland. It opposes or decries the voluntary loan subscribed by the American people to the Irish Republic. And by the neutrality laws, it shuts off American military supplies from the citizens of the Irish Republic, to whom geographic isolation and industrial conditions have denied the weapons to defend themselves and their cause. But it leaves England free to obtain here on credit all the food, clothing and munitions which her army in Ireland may require. It excuses England from payment of the \$500,000,000 now due as accumulated interest on the United States' \$4,000,000,000 loan to her. Through Administration officers, Redfield and Leffingwell, it even advocated the granting of a new official loan to England; and through the governmental Federal Reserve System, it has sanctioned the flotation here of gigantic credits within the last six months, to an England, swindling the American people by falsely pretending to represent the non-existent United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. It encourages the British to continue their attempts to suppress the Irish Republic, and it urges acceptance of every specious offer, made in all insincerity by the British Parliament, of colonial government for the Irish. In brief, even without the sanction of Article X, the United States is now preserving the territorial integrity of the British Empire by all the material strength of America, short of actual participation with American forces in the subjugation of the Irish Republic which Congress recognized.

The official American policy thus not merely flouts constitutional authority; it also violates the very principle on which this country was founded; it makes America the champion of legitimacy of the Divine right of existing States, a principle which the Revolution of 1776 forever denied; it surrenders the moral heritage which is the one justification of the independent existence of the United States; it places upon this country a measure of responsibility for the atrocities that, with American aid and comfort, England perpetrates in the Irish Republic.

The supporters of the American official policy comprise three distinct classes: (1) a pro-British, anti-Irish class, the lineal descendants of the Tories and Federalists, derived from social, financial and bureaucratic circles; (2) an American imperialist class, centered mainly in the great industries, which uphold legitimacy in imperial exploitation; and (3) those who sincerely fear that intervention on behalf of the Irish Republic might be made a pretext for war by England. These pro-English interventionists complacently read of the daily arrival of fresh troops and more artillery in Ireland; they see parliamentary reports of alleged impending risings in Ireland; and they permit these British preparations and anticipatory excuses for the massacre of the unarmed Irish citizenry to pass without protest; while they clamor for intervention in Armenia and Mexico, lands rich in oil and minerals. When the supremacy of England, not



even her independence, was menaced by Germany, these same pro-English interventionists demanded as American citizens that the United States should fight to save England. They freely taunted this nation with cowardice. They required as a right that the common bond of American citizenship should sanction their racial appeal for aid in the name of liberty. When this right was constitutionally conceded to the Anglo-American, the Irish-American loyally responded with his life, but when Congress, in the name of liberty, by recognizing the Irish Republic, constitutionally conceded this same right to the Irish-American, the Anglo-American responded with pro-English intervention. To be Irish-American may be the original sin against Anglo-American citizenship, but even the consciousness of that sin will not forever restrain American citizens of Irish blood from insisting upon their conceded constitutional right to this nation's sympathy for the cause of the Irish Republic.

Most of the American people, being carefully misinformed, and sedulously excited to racial and religious prejudice, tolerate the perpetuation of this official un-American and unconstitutional policy, of which they are ignorant. Those who are better informed have hitherto contented themselves with the satisfaction of wordy resolutions. But there is a limit to the fooling of the American people and to their patience. They are represented in Congress and Congress is not yet helpless. Through its control of appropriations it can be led to demand prompt payment by England of her just debts to America, a sum far exceeding the total cost of England's military occupation of the Irish Republic. In the event of massacre or other provocation, Congress can abrogate the treaties of amity and commerce existing between England and the United States. Congress can suspend the neutrality laws, or enact that these laws shall not apply to expeditions in aid of the Irish Republic. And Congress can signify its readiness to take other action, the mention of which would suffice to end the pro-English interventionist policy against the Irish Republic which Congress recognized.

A handful of brave American women is forcing the Federal Government to pass the Suffrage amendment. Organized zealots, who never polled for their Presidential candidate as many votes as there are Irish-Americans in Boston alone, terrorized the Federal Government into passing the Prohibition amendment. Jewish-Americans, on a mere question of passports, compelled Congress to force President Taft precipitately to abrogate the existing treaty of amity and commerce with Russia on February 7, 1911. Do the pro-English interventionists believe there are fewer American citizens championing the Irish Republic today than effectively championed the Russian Jews, or Woman Suffrage, or Prohibition? Or do the pro-English interventionists doubt the capacity of the American protagonists of the Irish cause to secure effective intervention on behalf of the recognized Irish Republic through the machinery of Congress?

The presumptions upon which the official American policy was based have been conclusively and completely disproved. The recognition of the Irish Republic by the supreme branch of the United States Government was not a perfunctory and insincere gesture. On March 18, 1920, the Senate, as the co-equal to the President in treaty-making authority, ratified in its executive capacity the legislative act of June 6, 1919, by passing a resolution incorporating the independence of Ireland as an integral condition in the international Treaty of Peace. The Irish Republic, far from being suppressed has continued to extend its governmental control in Ireland, and in the general municipal elections held on January 15, 1920, secured nearly ninety per cent of the votes. And the national acclaim which has greeted President de Valera in his tour through the United States, testifies to the ever increasing sympathy of the American people for the independence of the Irish Republic.

False in principle, founded in error, and unconstitutional in authority, the official American policy of pro-English intervention is likewise destructive of peace. It inevitably begets the war with England which it seeks to avert. That war may come as a direct consequence of the horror excited in Congress by a particularly revolting British outrage in Ireland, such as an Irish version of the recent Amritsar atrocity in India, a version for which the Irish stage is even now set. And if this dramatic crisis be avoided, until Congress adjourns in July, the war will irresistibly continue its insidious approach. The Presidential election and the contemplated campaign in Mexico, which England is encouraging, may delay but cannot prevent it. Naval competition between England and the United States for the mastery of the seas has already begun. Disputes with England over shipping and trade rights, over violations of the Monroe Doctrine through the Allied Reparations Committee, and over other litigious matters are fast becoming the current coin of the daily press. The polemics of Presidential aspirants catering to the pro-Irish vote will increase the national hostility to England. England herself may be relied upon to foster that hostility through her army in the Irish Republic. And so the day will infallibly come, when the United States, perhaps weakened and isolated on this continent by a preliminary imperial adventure in Mexico, will confront alone the allied British and Japanese Empires, in a struggle against the strangling supremacy of the selfsame British Empire, that the official American policy now champions against the Irish Republic, which Congress recognizes.

Those who, in contempt of the traditions, principles, dignity and even security of the United States as well as in defiance both of the legislative authority of Congress, and of the executive authority of the Senate, continue the present policy of pro-English intervention against the Irish Republic, are alone responsible for the war they are surely breeding; and for which this generation may yet hold them to strict accountability. Peace is still pos-

sible, but the pro-English interventionist either knows not how, or desires not, to attain it. He still lives in the dead days of the Committee of Four; although the treaty they framed is a scrap of paper in the waste-basket of the world's democracy. Clemenceau is gone with Orlando and Sonnino. The day of Lloyd George has set and a new era of freedom and justice has dawned. True, the English people, deceived by their rulers, and doubly deceived by the false official policy of this traditional land of freedom, continue to tolerate the British military occupation of the Irish Republic. But a short campaign of education would teach them the merits and justice of the Irish cause, which is their own cause, the cause of common people everywhere. By strikes they forced their rulers to withdraw the British armies from the Russian Republic. Given the understanding, they would if necessary by strikes compel their rulers to withdraw the British armies from the Irish Republic. And with the withdrawal of these armies would pass the now imminent danger of an Irish tragedy, irremediable except by war. Will the free and peace-loving people of America undertake this campaign in favor of the Irish Republic which Congress recognized?

And if the Executive power will give effect to the legislative recognition of the Irish Republic by Congress, and to the executive recognition of the Irish Republic by the Senate, not only will constitutional authority be vindicated in the United States, but the independence of the Irish Republic will be established in peace. Under the aegis of the United States, neutral nations would gladly fulfil the judicial function that their dignity as members of the family of nations requires of them; and accept jurisdiction over the Irish claim. The validity of Ireland's self-determination by ballot would be acknowledged by Norway, Sweden, and Denmark: for by ballot Norway separated from Sweden in 1905; and Iceland from Denmark in 1918. The traditional friendship of France, and the gratitude of Belgium to the Irish who died for her, would assure the adherence of these two States to the Irish cause. The South American Republics would not deny to the Irish Republic the aid the United States once gave to them. And the Russian Republic has already given unmistakable signs of sympathy with the Irish Republic. It is to the interest of all small nations to uphold the independence of the Irish Republic, which is founded on a principle that, once established, would guarantee the right of all people to the government of their own choice. It is the duty of every nation to ensure its own security by placing Ireland, the Heligoland of the Atlantic, under an independent sovereignty, and thus making free the seas. And it is essential to the untrammelled commercial intercourse of the world, that Ireland, the meeting place of East and West, should be an independent State offering equal facilities to all. Under American guidance, all friendly and interested neutral States could now readily be induced to recognize the independence of Ireland, as the independ-

ence of Belgium was recognized ninety years ago. If they acted in the same manner and at the same time, England's rulers would be forced to acquiesce. England could not make the recognition a pretext for war, even if she desired. The English people would not allow their already discredited rulers to place them in such an immoral conflict with the democracies of the world. There would be no war. There could be no war. Only a concerted expression of the world's opinion is needed to obtain the recognition of the Irish Republic and peace. Will America's Executive now seek that expression in favor of the Irish Republic which Congress recognized?

### COMMUNICATIONS

*Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words*

#### The Causes of National Prohibition

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The letter of your correspondent, J. M. Prendergast in AMERICA for March 6, on Masonry and Prohibition is indeed a sad disappointment for a historian who would determine the causes of national Prohibition. He was asked to give some facts which would show that Masonry was even a contributory cause to the coming of Prohibition. The agitation for that movement has been going on for years, and yet your correspondent gives as evidence a letter reported to be published six years ago in Belgium from a Mason in Ohio to one in Austria, saying that Masonry could do little against Catholicism while they were two parties in America. Therefore we have Prohibition! On January 10 your correspondent found Democrats and Republicans united on Prohibition and now he finds that Prohibition is "the wedge splitting the Democratic and Republican parties in twain." It seems to me that we expose ourselves to ridicule by such far-fetched conclusions from such vague premises. After this, your correspondent formulates a number of arguments of "Methodists," which he ascribes to Masons and then answers them. "To urge as our Masons would do," he says, but gives us no authority for his statement.

Next we have the "court decisions of Southern and Western States." I am aware of only the Oklahoma decision, though there may be others. But how does a decision of the court, saying that the legislators did not intend to include the Mass, prove that legislators did so intend, and further that the Masons put that intention into the legislators, because, forsooth, Masonry is always ready to attack the Church? How comes it then that all the Western and other States have not prohibited wine for sacramental purposes? How comes it the legislature of Nebraska went to Catholic authorities and asked them to word the law so that the Mass would be protected? It would seem that this great conspiracy has been a failure!

Your correspondent then asserts that Masons and Methodists are synonymous. On January 10, Methodism was "too decadent a force to account" for Prohibition and he brought in Masonry to help. Now he resorts to Methodism to help Masonry. There was, also, a meeting of Federated Churches in Baltimore which seems to have united all the various shades of Baptists and Methodists suddenly by a Masonic grip.

I wonder whether your correspondent is not hoaxing us when he advances these strange assertions as facts or legitimate deductions. Even Sherlock Holmes would hesitate so to conclude from such evidence. Let us have definite, specific facts that what Italian, French, English, Scotch, South American, and all other Masons have not done and could not do, has been done by Masons in America. Let us have proofs that Masons are Methodists or are using Methodists, and facts to show why Methodists have reached success just about this time in America.



To refer to a general purpose of hostility and to appeal to mysterious, unknown decrees which leak out through a solitary letter may encourage imaginative creations of the Taxil variety, but such methods do not produce history. Besides, they unduly flatter Methodism and Masonry, which have never before shown such power in America.

New York.

JOHN S. CREGAN.

#### Fostering Interest in the Missions

To the Editor of AMERICA:

After reading through Father O'Riordan's "The Parting of the Ways," in AMERICA for March 6, which may well serve as a major proposition, and Frank J. Atkins' communication "The Negro Problem and the K. of C.," in the same issue, which serves as a minor premise, the conclusion is at once apparent, if not strictly logical, that there is, therefore, a wide missionary field right here in our own country. A little reflection will bear out this statement. The following statistics taken from the "World Almanac" (1919) offer not a little serious thought. The population of the United States in 1917 was 104,444,303. The membership of all the religious denominations for the same year in the United States was 42,044,374. It follows then that there were 62,399,929 souls who professed to belong to no religious denomination whatsoever. Rather astounding, is it not? Now, how many of those who profess to belong to some religious denomination go to church at all, for that matter, or attend any services? Surely, their number is not legion. Is it not a fact, proved by what we read of it almost every day, that there is a woful lack of religious attendance in Protestant churches? What other purpose can the much-discussed union of the Protestant churches have but this, to keep a hold on their people and to prevent them from drifting into religious indifference, materialism, atheism, and downright paganism? Only a few weeks ago a minister told his hearers that an agent had called on him and had asked him how much he would take for his church and the church property. "What," exclaimed the Minister, "do you make it your business to buy up churches?" "Yes," replied the agent, "that is my business."

While we rejoice and are exceedingly glad that our people have, at last, awakened from their lethargy, and are now taking an active, generous, and enthusiastic interest in the work of the foreign missions, and while we can point with pride to three seminaries right here in the United States where our young men are trained for missionary labors abroad, still, we ought not to overlook the dire need of priests in our Western and Southern States especially. The heroic work of the Josephine Fathers, I fear, is not receiving the attention it should. How many Catholics ever hear of their work? In the January number of the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, I believe it was the Superior of the Society of St. Joseph, who wrote among other things concerning the aim and mission of the Society that seventy-five per cent of the vocations to this Society were, in recent years, frustrated by prejudice. In other words, three out of every four young men who had applied for work among our Colored people failed to reach the goal because, perhaps in most cases, doting parents looked askance upon their sons devoting themselves to that kind of labor. This is indeed a hard saying. And if Mr. Atkins' splendid suggestion is carried out by our Knights, as I sincerely trust it will be, should there not be priests in those very districts who will eventually admit the Colored neophyte into the true Fold of Christ? A glance through the "Catholic Directory" suffices to prove conclusively that in our Southern States, at least, there is an appalling shortage of priests. In one town of the diocese of Savannah, Georgia, I find that there are two priests attached to a parish church with thirty additional stations to care for. This is almost superhuman work for two priests. Of the 2,500,000 souls in North Carolina, 8,000 are Catholics. Figure out the percentage of Catholic souls. It is one third of one

per cent. The city of Durham alone has a population of 30,000, and I am informed by the resident priest there that of this number 115, including infants, are Catholics. The objection is often urged that a good deal of bigotry exists in these Southern States. Of what use then would priests be down there? On this subject the pastor of the Church of the Immaculate Conception in Durham writes: "The people as a whole are gradually coming nearer and nearer to the Church. The good work of the Knights of Columbus during the war and the commingling of the Southern soldiers with their Catholic fellow-countrymen on the battlefield has done very, very much to wear away prejudice." Who then will give the word of God to those still outside the Fold except our priests, and many of them?

"Now is the time," Father O'Riordan writes, "to begin a campaign of education for home and foreign missions." Indeed, now is the time, but the campaign of education ought to begin in the home. Our priests and Sisters "can effectively spread the missionary idea." But parents can do more. They can foster in the hearts of their sons a vocation for missionary work. The seed may fall on good ground and blossom forth into a beautiful flower, a priestly vocation for home and foreign fields. The spark of the love of God may enkindle in their tender hearts the flame even of martyrdom. Surely this, or something akin to it, namely, generous, untiring work away from home and amid uncongenial surroundings perhaps, ought to be the fruit of that maturity which our Church in these States seems to enjoy today. Moreover, our Catholic missionary literature can be had for almost a trifle. Let a good supply of this missionary literature enter our homes. Let the parents go over the articles and illustrations with their growing boys and girls and point out to them how bereft thousands and millions of souls are of the consolations which our Church brings to us. Let the little ones be told also to pray repeatedly that Almighty God may make known to them their future state of life. Cannot very much be done in the way of fostering a vocation for the missionary life by curbing their restless, almost passionate longing for worldly distractions, such as the movies, and the like? Even in the event of there being no vocation or any manifest signs of one, at least this much will have been gained; a firmer faith, and an interest in the things of God.

Granite, Md.

WILLIAM F. JORDAN.

#### Misery in Vienna

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Will you kindly permit me to call to the attention of your readers the urgent need there is of saving the dying people of Vienna? Misery in the city is intense and indescribable. The following details, however, will give some idea of the situation. The inhabitants, 2,500,000 in number, through the dismemberment of the old empire, have been cut off completely from all bases of supplies, and are without food, fuel, or raw materials. Money has sunk to a fiftieth of its original value, that is to say, it has no value whatever in foreign markets, so that nothing can be bought in foreign countries, and only the rich can afford to have cooked food, and to have heat in one or two rooms. Babies die at birth in maternity hospitals because of the cold. University professors receive six dollars a month. Thousands are wretchedly clad and without shoes. Statistics show 1,036 deaths a week to eight births. There is practically no healthy child in Vienna, school children are too weak to use the playgrounds. For these little ones Mr. Hoover is doing his best, feeding 160,000 children in Vienna one meal every day. They are fed in shifts of six weeks. These few details will serve to indicate with horrible clearness the crying need these poor people have of assistance. Mr. Hoover has established warehouses in Vienna; so that if any one is desirous of helping the city, he has only to pay for a draft at any bank in the United States. The bank sends the draft to Vienna where it can be exchanged for food.

New York.

MARGARET STONBOROUGH.

# A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1920

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.  
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSEIN;  
Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

## "We Shall All Rise Again"

WITH a passionate insatiate craving that triumphs over vague misgivings and sets at naught distressing doubts, the human heart longs for happiness, not the unstable, precarious sort that is attainable in this valley of tears, but happiness secure from anxiety, beyond the ravages of disappointment and of death, and no longer the sport of influences over which the individual has no control. Stoicism cannot conquer this longing, agnosticism only removes it to the background of consciousness, poverty and failure make it constant pain, prosperity and success merely give it sharper definition. And so it is that man, whether learned or unlettered, looks and has always looked with straining eyes for a future life in which at last his soul shall be at peace. He will not, he cannot stifle his hope for immortality. He knows that the end of all is not the grave. He is certain that he was not made to die.

Philosophies and religions have all been concerned with the problem of this ineradicable desire, and their popularity and tenure of existence have depended largely on the strength of the promise they have given of its ultimate fruition. Even materialistic evolution, after robbing its followers of their age-old hope, found itself obliged to cater to this urgent demand by holding out the phantom of constant progress, gradual betterment and eventual perfection, if not of the individual, at least of the race. But the heart of man revolted against this altruistic utopia, and a phase of this reaction is represented in the more serious Spiritism of the present day, which endeavors by laboratory methods to give to the skeptic and the world-weary a scientific assurance of survival after death.

The Catholic needs no such assurance. Whether or not philosophy can prove beyond all doubt that the human soul is immortal by its very nature, he is not vitally concerned; the testimony of spirits, even if it could give certain proof of existence in another world, would not add the slightest weight to his conviction that his soul will never die; that its partner, his mortal body, after its

dissolution will rise again; and that in his own flesh, in the integrity of his perfect human nature, immortalized by Divine power, he shall see his God. Not on the trivial revelations of disembodied spirits does he build his hope of survival after death. But on the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

"Behold," says St. Paul, "I tell you a mystery. We shall all rise again . . . Thanks be to God, who has given us the victory through Our Lord Jesus Christ . . . If the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again . . . But now Christ is risen from the dead . . . And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive." The certainty of death casts a shadow over this life, but the shadow wears thin in the Divine promise of immortality. Life is not taken away, only its condition is changed; the temporary dwelling of the land of pilgrimage is dissolved, but in its place there awaits for Christ's friends an everlasting abode in Heaven. No longer is the grave filled with the tears of hopeless despair, it is fragrant with the perfume of undying hope. We have not here a lasting city, we look for another; and our expectation has its foundations in Christ's triumph over death. Unbelievers may pin their dreams of a sublimated form of wretched mortal existence to the supposed utterances of a Dr. Phinuit or an Emperor; Catholics put their faith in the Master of life and death. Every Easter the words come ringing down the centuries. "I tell you a mystery. We shall all rise again."

## Up Money, Down Souls

MONEY, especially that which is wrung from the poor by hard, dishonest means, is the most desirable acquisition in the whole world. With it comes social ambition that so far perverts the finest instincts of parents that they readily hand their children over body and soul to influences that lead to the destruction of their souls. Moreover, this supreme gift of nature, gold, converts into blatant prigs simple, unaffected men whose wholesouled frankness was as winning as the innocence of children. It is a great gift, is money, the sum of all happiness, the end of man in fact. And that is the precise reason why nations and individuals brutalize themselves and others in attempts to fill their coffers.

It is natural for man to acquire wealth, for this they were created: therefore, they should by all means prostitute the greatest gifts of mind and heart to the dollar. And they do so with a zest that is truly marvelous. The virtue of women, the lives of children, the happiness of workmen, must all give way to Shylock's fist or heel or tongue or cunning, for Shylock is right, he is following nature's call, and virtue is wrong, and children are a nuisance, and the happiness of the workman is a bromide. And God, well, what has He to do with economics?

Hence it is that when the war was on, the newspaper patriots, Shylocks all, took wings, flew about like carrion fowl and picked out the eyes of the wives and children



of soldiers who were bleeding in France. When the war was done and blind people walked about anxiously, in an attempt to find food within the reach of their all but depleted purse, Shylock turned a new trick. The food was at his command; the poor were hungry, but they still had some blood left. That, Shylock would drink, and he got it to drink, did Shylock. He seized the homes of his victims and turned the inmates out: and the rich man was happy once again; he had gained some more of man's greatest gift—money and infamy. Around him stood his victims, little children, underfed, because Shylock would profit to excess in food, he would have their flesh; little children, blue with cold, because Shylock would profit to excess in rent, he would have their blood. Truly, money is the greatest of all things: it makes a man a devil, and after that—hell.

#### "The Horns of the Unicorns"

**J**UST why that highly interesting animal, the unicorn, cannot abide the humble is not altogether clear. But we do know that the Psalmist prays fervently that his low estate may be safeguarded from "the horns of the unicorns." It would appear that those proud monsters used to be put into such a towering passion by the mere sight of a truly humble man, that they always made a sudden rush at him with the object of impaling the inoffensive wight on their long, sharp horn. At that critical moment his only hope of safety lay, of course, in bravely holding his ground till the charging beast was quite near and then suddenly darting behind a big tree. Unable to change its course, the monster would then drive its horn deep into the trunk and stand a quivering, snorting prisoner wholly at the humble man's mercy. But the animals that the lowly minded enraged so were tamed and soothed, strange to say, by the pure of heart and in olden times, tradition avers, many a guileless maiden could be seen with soft-eyed unicorns fawning at her feet.

Though the renowned monster that hated the lowly so bitterly, yet loved with equal intensity the clean of heart, is happily extinct and appears nowadays only as a supporter of Great Britain's Royal Arms and in other heraldic devices, the two fragrant virtues that alternately roused its wrath and stirred its affection, fortunately, are still thriving in this sin-laden old world. Thousands of youths and maidens, for instance, are smitten every year with the heavenly beauty of the Evangelical Counsels and, deaf to the pleadings of self-indulgence and pride, joyfully embrace the religious life, and thus make public profession of lowliness and purity. Unhappily, however, the overbearing pride symbolized by the ramping unicorn is also no less sturdy and aggressive now than in days of old. The social climber who can find no Catholic school "fashionable" enough for her children is a unicorn-like menace to the humility of her neighbors, for the fear of being outstripped in prestige makes them send their own

boys and girls to the same non-Catholic schools she chooses for hers. The unicorn of pride also menaces the spiritual health of Mrs. Climber's husband, for on observing that few of his more "successful" business acquaintances seem to profess any faith whatever, he gradually gives up the practice of his. But the arrogant unicorn will not let even the fair Miss Climber possess her soul in lowliness and purity. Though the Holy Father has entreated all Catholic ladies to promote by their influence and example the movement for greater modesty in dress, on the other hand fashion decrees that under penalty of "society's" grave disapproval they must wear shameful gowns and share in perilous amusements, and how often, alas, the unicorn prevails with them over the Pontiff! Without question a far wider and stricter observance of the old-fashioned virtues of modesty and lowliness is required than is now manifested in our land, if American Catholics are to play the part they should in making the nation a really great and powerful commonwealth. Let us pray, then, to be delivered from "the horns of the unicorns."

#### The Crime of the Powers

**A**N appeal has recently been sent to all the Bishops of the English-speaking world to aid in saving the German foreign missions. A war after the war is silently going on. Catholic missionaries who have not as yet been sent into banishment are quietly being exiled even now, or threatened with this fate. The very mission clause of the Treaty of Peace leaves them at the mercy of "the Allied and Associated Powers." It is not Germany that is being punished in these innocent victims of political intrigue and ambition, but the pagan nations which are ruthlessly deprived of Christ, and the many Christian missions that are in danger of being consigned to spiritual starvation and death. For after France, Germany stood second in the Catholic mission cause.

Not one single complaint has ever been raised and justified against the devoted men and women of German nationality who for years had labored so successfully and unselfishly in more than fifty mission fields. Yet as early as October, 1914, seventeen Oblates of Mary were put into concentration camps, in Ceylon. The same indignity was soon inflicted upon twenty-five Jesuits in Bombay. A similar fate overtook many others in the following year. Deportations now began. From India alone eighty-eight priests, twenty-four clerics and Brothers, and twenty-five Sisters were carried away on the Golconda. Pressure was brought to bear even upon China by the English Government to expel its missionaries. We thus behold the almost incredible sight of a Christian Government morally forcing an unwilling heathen nation to declare a new Christian persecution, and to take the most effective means of stamping out the Faith in its dominions, by driving away the shepherds of the flock. Pagan Japan was more merciful to the

ambassadors of Christ, who had come to its shore with His commission, than were England, France, Italy or the United States. We too have shamefully disgraced ourselves by the expulsion of loyal Catholic missionaries from the Philippines.

The godless work now progressed rapidly over all the earth and is continuing today. There followed, we are told by the Fathers of the Divine Word, the banishment of over a hundred Sisters from Egypt; the expulsion of forty-two priests, forty Brothers and thirty Sisters from the Cameroons, constituting the whole mission force; the removal of forty-one priests, fifteen Brothers and twenty-nine Sisters from Togoland, the entire mission staff; and the imprisonment or banishment, all without cause, of sixty-two priests, ninety-seven Brothers and fifty-four Sisters from German East Africa. In the once well-equipped Cameroon missions there are now but eight priests at work, without the aid of a single Brother or Sister. For the effective missionary communities of Togoland but three priests and three Sisters could be found to act as substitutes. It is easy to understand how profoundly the heart of the great Pastor of Christendom is touched.

A dreadful injustice has been committed. The missions, as a Protestant organ has well said, are "supernational." Their consecrated apostles are not mere pawns in the grimy selfish game of international politics, to be cast aside at pleasure, when no offense of any kind has been incurred. Catholic missionaries are sent by the Vicar of Christ, they are laboring in the name of Christ, as His representatives and ambassadors to pagan lands; they have no interest except in the Cross of Christ and are loyal to whatever flag floats over them, teaching always obedience to every lawfully constituted authority.

A great crime has been committed against Christianity. It has been written into the very Treaty of Peace. Nothing less than the combined action of the Catholics of the world is called for, that the rights of our Catholic missionaries may again be acknowledged the rights of Christianity and of the Gospel, that must be placed safely and forever above the intrigues of politics. We need the courage of that speaker at the Congress of Christian Workmen held at Luzerne in Switzerland, March, 1919, when solemnly pointing to the figure of the Saviour nailed to the Cross, he said:

In the name of the Crucified I conjure this Congress not to separate before turning its attention to the violation of the Congo act by the Entente and the expulsion of the German missionaries from China, and before transmitting the protest of this meeting to the Paris Conference.

The fruits of that great sacrifice of Christ were wilfully impeded, as this representative of a neutral nation so clearly implied, by the violation of the sacred treaty that was to keep the war from Africa and safeguard the mission interests. They are impeded now by the war after the war that is still continuing in the arbitrary banishment or exclusion of Catholic missionaries.

### The Sad World

THE world is sad, these days, and rightly so. For many years past it has been looking through a welter of blood, watching for the dawn of peace which, somehow or other, will not eventuate. On the contrary, the dark prospect of 1919 has merged into the darker prospect of 1920, and despair has settled down on once hopeful nations. All this is due to pure egoism and selfishness. For these very reasons the Peace Conference was one of the great calamities of the world's history. Four men, apparently incapable of broad vision or human interest, took upon themselves to decide the affairs of nations, in the name and for the sake of democracy. They convened and went their several ways, and the Christian world has never been in a worse condition. The old diplomacy of every nation for itself won out at Paris. Penalties and reparation were uppermost, suffering men and women and children were last in the thoughts of the conferees whose people fought a great war for the sake of brotherhood and everlasting peace. Undoubtedly, the Peace Conference is to blame for a thousand and one of our ills. It bungled and procrastinated and left ten problems where it found one. Meantime, capital stabs labor, labor chokes capital, England annexes territory, women and children starve—and the Peace Conference? May it never return in its old form, a junta of four dictators with whose advice and administration the world can well dispense. It is time now, if ever, for open covenants openly arrived at; for a conference of men whose hearts as well as their lips are with the people. And when they convene, it were well for them to draw wisdom from God, for the last Peace Conference cannot be repeated.

## Literature

### "PLAYING THE SEDULOUS APE"

TO conceive bold projects, to plan them with a flourish, and to carry them out with swift, sure stroke—this, I think, is the part which human kind is most prone to favor. One draws, colors, and gives its web of light and shade to a mythical masterpiece, or conveys to some non-existent sculpture its final ennobling touch, or deftly pens some phantom prose-bit. The priceless vision inevitably disappears. In a manner very unlike the pantomime of old, the glorious side of the scene is found

to have come first. There is a chance that if the dreamer tries to make his air-castles real he will, unless a practised workman, find himself struggling with splotched lines, an unshapely mass, or a messy page. It were better, in such a case, that he come to what is possibly his real part, that of the novice, the "despised beginner." It were not amiss, either, that in learning his art he consider the manner of those old-time craftsmen who derived their many bright tricks-of-trade from imitating the style and manner of their betters.



We owe it to Stevenson, among others, that imitation of the masters in writing, as a path to greater things in one's own technique, has a staunch defender. No one who has read that pertinent bit of comment, "A College Magazine," will forget his words:

I have played the sedulous ape to Hazlitt, to Lamb, to Wordsworth, to Sir Thomas Browne, to DeToc, to Hawthorne, to Montaigne, to Baudelaire, and to Obermann.

That, like it or not, is the way to learn to write; whether I have profited or not, that is the way.

Such a declaration in this day, rich with image-breakers, comes near to drawing blood. The ultra-modern would have it that playing the ape, as something medieval and too frankly orthodox, be indicted and forbidden the freedom of letters. In withstanding such attempt, Stevenson might be called first counsel for the defense. "That, like it or not, is the way to learn." No testimony is more dogmatic than his and, coming from one of the most brilliant and interesting among English writers of the last century, has an emphasis which of itself almost does away with objection. With Newman and Ruskin, Stevenson acknowledges his ease and polish to be the result of a hard study and long apprenticeship. With Keats, Burns, Shakespeare, and geniuses of the pen such as Cicero and Montaigne, he makes no secret of the matter of that apprenticeship. It consisted in "playing the sedulous ape."

As in all stalwart treatises on matters of moment, there is likely a duty in this paper of giving an explanation of the method of learning to write which it espouses. Not that playing the ape is a thing strange to mortal ken. Consciously or unconsciously, we are arch-imitators in writing as in other earthly deeds, and whether we wish to look upon a conscious imitation as the way to learn the writer's art or not, the fact prevails that it is a way, and a good one. When instancing various methods of securing facility with the pen, we come upon the good and ancient custom of keeping a diary, the presumption in its favor being that it gives practice in the choice of the correct word. There is, too, the habit of practising description, much encouraged among the rising generation. Both may be classed under that direction of many current writers which is usually worded, "Write, write, and keep on writing!" Now when one plays the ape he goes a step further in acquiring his art. He practises assiduously whether it be at a diary, description, or some similar prose or verse type, but he does this with a model before him—the work of some writer whose virtues of expression he admires and would secure as his own. He is like to the young student of art striving after the perfect lines of the Milo or the young musician forming himself on the masterpieces of the composers. He learns as did the craftsmen of old.

Herein lies the difference between "playing the sedulous ape" and the various other means of attaining effect in one's style and manner. Herein, if anywhere, is its advantage: to wit, the standard it offers one to labor for the ideals it presents for one's emulation. Both are as necessary to good writing as they are needed in any pursuit. Keeping a diary and practising description give a certain exercise of thought and of power in discharging an idea, but they hardly of themselves give the seeker a goal to look to in his quest of a better style. Without skilful advice as to their use, they are liable to lead one away from any idea of a standard and cause him to forget ideals, without which there is little progress and without which there is lost the best force in molding one's manner. It is the standard which is badly needed in the writing of the day. It is the standard which Stevenson remarks not having found outside of imitation. "Regarded as training," he says, "it had one grave defect; for it set me no standard of achievement."

It has often been a question whether or not other authors have felt the enthusiasm of Stevenson over their early efforts at

"playing the sedulous ape." None, very likely, have left the same testimony to their belief in its being the one way to learn the art of writing. So much, they seem to think, depends on the man and his peculiar needs. Cardinal Newman, however, who has been oft-quoted in this connection, makes no secret of his glowing respect for the influence his literary models had upon him:

For myself, when I was fourteen or fifteen, I imitated Addison; when I was seventeen, I wrote in the style of Johnson; about the same time I fell in with the twelfth volume of Gibbon, and my ears rang with the cadence of his sentences, and I dreamed of it for a night or two. Then I began to make an analysis of Thucydides in Gibbon's style.

In a vein kin to this of Newman runs a passage in John Ruskin's "Praeterita": "I have said that had it not been for constant reading of the Bible, I might possibly have taken Johnson for my model of English. To a useful extent I have always done so." And echoing Ruskin closely comes the acknowledgment of the late Robert Hugh Benson, a significant figure in recent Catholic literature, who gives notice of his early work imitating the style of Stevenson and of Ruskin himself. No small tribute, this, to be accorded the honor which in youth one gave to another.

It is serious labor for most of us, this learning to write, and "playing the sedulous ape" is labor of a special sort. At all times there is the question of "expressing oneself", if only after one's own fashion. At times when we imitate it is the matter of doing this after the manner of another. For no one has the task been more serious, though, than for him whom we have looked to as the sponsor of this little paper. Stevenson it is, again. He makes remark:

Whenever I read a book or passage that particularly pleased me. . . . I must sit down at once and set myself to ape that quality. I was unsuccessful, and I knew it; and tried again, and was again unsuccessful and always unsuccessful; but at least in these vain bouts, I got some practice in rhythm, in harmony, in construction and in co-ordination of parts.

Methods of learning to write, it is true, are as many as are men with varied ideas and varied experience. In a general shake-up, it is as that very modern novelist, Mr. Tarkington, remarks, "We must work it out alone. We must learn by failure and by repeated efforts how the thing should be done." But Mr. Tarkington has himself played the ape, and he says this looking hard into his own past, gazing back fondly on his own monkey tricks.

PAUL D. SULLIVAN, S. J.

### SUBSTITUTION

Now when the solid earth slips under your feet

And all's undone,

Look up, take heart, the unchanging Heaven is won!

Here the rose fadeth, joy goes by so fleet,

A bubble bright,

But to be blown on and to vanish quite.

Lay hold on things eternal for things brief!

Nothing will stay;

Youth is a flower, withering, passing away.

Canker is in the rose, blight on the leaf,

Rust on the gold:

The joy of earth a tale soon over and told.

Earth's for beginnings: there shall be no end:

Time is not done

When Love's drawn up to Love and both are one.

Here is your solid land; your lease is penned,

Fairly 'tis writ:

Heaven's yours in perpetuity: seize on it.

KATHARINE TYNAN.

## REVIEWS

**The Life of John Marshall.** By ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE. Four Volumes. Illustrated. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co. \$20.00.

John Marshall's unassailable claim to renown is that he made the Supreme Court. The warrant for this Court's existence is indeed found in the third article of the Constitution, but that article does not describe, and may not warrant, the Court which existed when John Marshall died. For it is by no means clear, either from the text of the Constitution, or from the intention of those who framed it, that the Supreme Court was to be clothed with power to negative an act of a coordinate branch of government, thereby making itself the first of the three. Yet in the famous *Marbury vs. Madison*, Marshall undertook to establish, and did establish, that in the judiciary rested "the exclusive power to declare any statute unconstitutional" State as well as Federal, and "to announce that the Supreme Court was the ultimate arbiter as to what is and what is not law under the Constitution". Under a strict construction, the Supreme Court was no longer a "coordinate" branch of government. Inasmuch as it might completely balk the will of the legislature, it was a superior department. Today five men may hold that what is demanded by the people, enacted by Congress, and approved by the President, must be rejected, and can enforce their decision. A mighty power this; yet it must be admitted that during the long years of its existence, this august Court has exercised its great powers with unvarying benignity and justice. Marshall's purpose in this initial decision was to "save the government from warring factions whose dissensions must in the end paralyze the administration of the nation's affairs", and he did it in a phrase that grated as harshly as treason on the ears of the author of the Declaration of Independence. Yet he himself thereby forced another contention, beyond the jurisdiction even of the great body over which he presided. That contention came to an end at Appomattox, as far as the judgment of war can compose a question of constitutional construction.

For once this reviewer is disposed to endorse a publisher's advertisement. Mr. Beveridge's work has minor faults, as, for instance, his references to the non-existent Jesuits of New Orleans in connection with the Burr conspiracy, and his utter inability to see any real patriotism in Thomas Jefferson; but his four volumes are absolutely indispensable to the student of American history. A soldier of the Revolution, Marshall lived through a stirring period, and bore himself greatly. In his private life the great Chief Justice was above reproach; simple, affable, unassuming, and in his care of his afflicted wife, affectionate and devoted. But Mr. Beveridge's attempt to trace a parallel with another great American is unfortunate. In their uprightness and simplicity the two men were much alike; but in his heart of hearts, John Marshall was afraid of the people, while Abraham Lincoln never faltered in his belief that the people were fully competent to sustain the government which they themselves had created.

P. L. B.

**Cardinal Mercier's Own Story.** By His Eminence, D. J. CARDINAL MERCIER, Archbishop of Malines. Prefatory Letter by His Eminence JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS. Introduction by Professor FERNAND MAYENCE, of Louvain University. New York: George H. Doran Co. \$4.00.

One of the most extraordinary tributes ever paid to Cardinal Mercier came from the very enemies whom he had so boldly faced during the four years in which they occupied his country. On October 17, 1918, Baron von der Lancken, Head of the Political Department of the German Governor General of Belgium personally announced to his Eminence the approaching release of all political Belgian prisoners and handed him a note which openly vindicated the policy pursued by the brave prelate: "You are in our estimation," the note said, "the incarnation of occu-

pied Belgium of which you are the venerated and trusted pastor. For this reason, it is to you that the Governor General and my Government also have commissioned me to come and to announce that when we evacuate your soil, we wish to hand over to you, unasked and of our own free will, the political prisoners serving their time, either in Belgium or in Germany." The words are not only a tribute to Désiré Mercier, they are a vindication of the policy of the Prince of the Church, who during the entire tragedy which unfolded itself on the fields of Belgium was the soul of his country.

This conviction will be deepened by even a very hasty perusal of this remarkable book, one of the masterpieces, undoubtedly, springing out of the war. Its author has done many things supremely well. He excels in philosophy, in the sphere of education and ecclesiastical administration, as a speaker, as a diplomat. Here he shows that he possesses in a marked degree the historical instinct. History is the witness of the past, and so the Cardinal knows that it must be a chain of well-linked evidence, a record of well-proven facts. The evidence he sums up, the facts he records, without passion or prejudice. His speeches, addresses, pastorals, document after document that passed between him and the German Governor-General, Baron von Bissing, and Baron von Falkenhausen and the Head of the Political Department of the Governor-General, Baron von der Lancken, are laid before the reader. The Cardinal in these documents, which will make history for all time, comforts his people, speaks up for right, proposes an inquiry into the murder by German troops of priests belonging to the diocese of Malines, begs the release of Belgian doctors and chemists held prisoners at Heidelberg, prays in all sincerity for the repose of the soul of Baron von Bissing, when he hears of his death, and makes it known to all that although, not a Catholic, as it has sometimes been stated, the deceased Governor-General was a believer in Christ.

As they lay down the book, its readers will be filled with admiration for the prudence and fortitude of the author. Throughout there is a perfect balance between the impulses of patriotism and the demands of law and justice. Wrongs are resented with burning indignation, but without empty clamor or unpriestly language. The writer knows what he owed to the de-facto rulers of Belgium, but he makes us see that he never has forgotten the laws of his country, and the verdict of a still higher court than that of the German conquerors. J. C. R.

## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

"From Dust to Glory, a Sequel to 'The Straight Path'" (Longman's, \$1.60), by the Rev. M. J. Phelan, S. J., is really a thinly disguised triduum of meditations from the Exercises of St. Ignatius. Having brought the inquiring non-Catholic into the true Church, the author now undertakes to guide him to Heaven. In presenting the familiar truths of the Foundation, the Fall, the Kingdom, etc., Father Phelan aims at making them very striking by the frequent use of figures, anecdotes and comparisons which will keep the exercitant mentally stimulated. "Touch me not, I belong to Caesar," for instance, the words on the collar of the great Julius's milk-white fawn, are adroitly turned to illustrate Christ's claims on the redeemed soul. "Earth's Priceless Treasure," "The Garden's Gloom," and "The Light of Victory," the three concluding chapters of the book, are suitable meditations for Holy Thursday, Good Friday and Easter Day.

"In Hand-Made Fables" (Doubleday, \$1.50), the new book with which George Ade breaks the silence of several years, he effectively uses the "American language" to castigate some thirty vices and foibles of his fellow-countrymen. "The Waist-Band that was Taut up to the Moment it gave Way," for instance, amusingly contrasts the simple food-problem of ante-bellum days with its present insoluble character and "The Fable of the



Uplift that Moved Side Ways," tells of how Rodney J. Whipple sailed to Dolsifar in 1887 to be Consul of Comato and on returning recently to see what progress his country had been making meanwhile, was so shocked by the shamelessness of today's plays and dances that he fled back blushing to innocent Comato. Mr. McCutcheon's pictures are perfectly in keeping with the text—"The Penance of Magdalena and Other Tales of the California Missions" (Houghton Mifflin, \$1.00), by J. Smeaton Chase, are taken from his larger work, "The California Padres and Their Missions." The slender book is intended as a souvenir for California tourists. The last of the tales is in decidedly bad taste—"The Worker and His Work" (Lippincott, \$2.00) is an illustrated collection of readings in present-day literature which describe various trades and crafts. Stella Stewart Center, the compiler of the book, has chosen forty or more chapters or verses from the writings of such authors as Arnold Bennet, Christopher Morley, Edna Ferber, Eden Phillpotts, Henry Sydnor Harrison, etc., to show how the world's work is done today. The volume makes good supplementary reading for high-school pupils—"Danny Again" (Putnam) by Vera C. Barclay, is a set of stories for boys under twelve, each tale in style and language being aptly suited to lads passing the fairy-story period. They all teach in an interesting way lessons of courage and unselfishness.

The thesis on the nature and necessity of "Divine Charity" (Gill, Dublin), which Dr. Patrick O'Neill presented to the theological faculty of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, for the Doctorate in Sacred Theology, is an excellent essay to show that acts of love are easy and within the reach of all who are trying to avoid mortal sin. This is the thesis of "God, Our Father," by Father F. J. Boudreaux, S.J., and of the classic "Heaven Open to Souls," by Father Semple, S.J. What stimulates interest in the procedure of Dr. O'Neill, is that he makes the love of God *our* supreme good, generally called an act of love of concupiscence, to be an act of perfect charity. In support of this theological opinion, he cites St. Augustine, St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas and the theologians De Lugo, Ballerini, Schiffrini, Tanqueray, Palmieri and Hurter. By an unfortunate printing of *likely* for *unlikely*, Dr. O'Neill is made to say (p. 43) that *trust* is a fourth theological virtue.—In "The Catholic American" (Benziger, \$1.25) Father George T. Schmidt offers the reader eighteen short and practical papers on such subjects as church-support, mixed marriages, Spiritism, worldliness, Socialism, etc. In the chapter on "The Prominent Catholic" the author does well to call attention to our need of many more thoroughly educated men and women.

"Glamour" (Bobbs-Merrill, \$1.75), by W. B. Maxwell, is an interesting novel, well conceived and carefully elaborated, which portrays the reactions of an upright man to a great temptation. A first love, which comes to naught on account of the girl's selfishness and the man's passivity, is supplanted for a number of years by another love, enshrined in marriage, less intense but fully satisfying. Success and happiness of a commonplace type lull to rest the memory of the more romantic, soul-shaking passion, but the deliberate reappearance of it troubles the placid current of the man's life and lures him from his stern moral anchorage. The shame of his realization of his lapse from rectitude, and the fear of his powerlessness to resist, tempt him to suicide, from which he is saved only by enlisting in the war. Cheated of his hope of ending his struggle by an honorable death in action, he sets his face against further trifling with danger, and finally regains domestic happiness.—Sensing with the sure instinct of the true novelist the atmosphere of current interest, Lucas Malet has written in "The Tall Villa" (Doran, \$1.75), a clever Spiritistic romance, in which a disillusioned and care-worn lady at first for her own comfort, and later for

altruistic motives, evokes from the world of the dead a suicidal relative, condemned to haunt the scene of his crime of a century before. Believing that her mission in life is to cure the unhappy victim of his unholy passion, for it is only through reformation that he can be set at rest, she summons his ghost, woos and wins him in a number of private seances, and having accomplished her purpose, and learned that he will return no more, breathes out her own soul in an access of platonic affection and goes to rejoin him in the world of spirits. The book, apart from its initial absurdity, is not so absurd as it sounds, at least in the manner of its portrayal, for the author is very skilful and has steered her way clear of a thousand minor absurdities. From a Catholic point of view the whole proceeding is, of course, fundamentally reprehensible, which makes it the less intelligible that a Catholic should have treated such a theme.—E. F. Benson's "Robin Linnet" (Doran, \$1.75), is a study of England in the period before the war and during its first stage. The thread of the story is rather slight, but the characters of the Cambridge boy and his worldly, skeptical mother make the book worth reading. The author is pitiless in his analysis of the banality and futility of so-called high society, but redeems the picture by showing the nobility with which the idle rich responded to the call of auguished humanity.

## EDUCATION

### Who's to Blame?

OF 500,000 Irish schoolchildren, about 150,000 are estimated not to attend school. "In many cases, the average attendance is not more than sixty per cent of those on the rolls of the school," write the members of the Vice-regal Committee of Inquiry in Primary Education, Ireland, in a report lately published by his Majesty's Stationery Office, Dublin. "We hear of children at ten years of age or even younger, forsooth sufficiently educated members of the community; and there are, we fear, many children who never go to school."

Now the Committee is afraid. Ireland already revolts. More "un-education," it believes, means more revolt. In solemn polysyllables the Committee says: "Society has grown profoundly apprehensive of the dangers that lurk behind many neglected ills in the body politic and is determined if only for its own protection that every effort shall be made to mitigate them. . . . Experiences have led to a vivid recognition of the necessity of coping in a more zealous and courageous fashion than heretofore with the grave social problems that confront civilization." Thereupon, with the courage born of this conviction, the Committee begins to cope with the grave social problem: "Why don't Irish children go to school?"

Reason one: There are not enough schools to go to. Belfast teachers testified before the Committee that in their city alone there are 15,000 children without school accommodations. Some are on the streets and some are squeezed into already overcrowded classrooms. Many Belfast babies are packed into educational holes of Calcutta; in one room, for instance, with facilities for forty-seven there are 107 children. New schools, said the teachers, are needed not only for these pupils but for those incarcerated in unsuitable schools, in stoveless, grateless schools where the only hope of warmth is from the gas that must burn in the dark rooms even on bright days. On the point of unsuitability, the testimony of a social investigator named F. H. Dale was quoted. He said:

As a result of my investigations I have no hesitation in reporting that both in point of convenience for teachers and in the requirements necessary for the health of teachers and scholars, the average school-building in Dublin and Belfast is markedly inferior to the average school-building now in use in English cities of corresponding size.

So if unsuitable schools were removed, Belfast would have to provide for some thousands of children beyond the estimate of 15,000, and other localities according to their similar great need.

## GOOD PRIMARY TEACHERS TOO FEW

**R**EASON two: Live, interesting primary teachers are few in Ireland. Look, says the Committee, at the 1918 education-office report; out of 13,256 teachers only 3,820 are marked highly efficient. The extra low pay, says the Committee, does not begin to compensate for the extra great sacrifices they must make. Women teachers in Ireland begin at \$405 a year; men at \$500. If it were not for the fact that there are very few openings for educated young men and women in an agricultural country, there would probably be even greater scarcity. Those who determine to teach in Ireland must resign themselves to social and professional hermitage, for three-fourths of the schools are rural.

Who's to blame? asks the Committee. Who holds back the money necessary to get good teachers and good buildings? England, it answers. England established a central board of education in Ireland, and agreed that through this board it would pay two-thirds of school-building bills and teachers' salaries to any one zealous enough to erect a school. Does England come through with the promised funds? Not, says the Committee, unless she feels like it. In 1900, she agreed with Ireland that her teachers should be paid more, but stipulated that the increase in pay would not mean an immediate increase in grants. New building grants were suspended altogether for a time. In 1902, an annual grant of £185,000 was diverted from Irish primary education and used for quite extraneous purposes. And when England does permit money for Irish education, she pays no heed to the requirements stated by the Irish commissioners of education. Instead she decides by herself: "This much I am giving to English education; I will grant a proportionate amount to Irish education."

If English primary education happens to require financial aid from the Treasury, Irish primary education is to get some and in proportion thereto (writes the Committee). If England happens not to require any, then, of course, neither does Ireland. A starving man is to be fed only if someone else is hungry. . . . It seems to us extraordinary that Irish primary education should be financed on lines that have little relation to the needs of the case. . . . Accordingly we strongly recommend a reform in the method of distributing grants from public funds for primary education in Ireland.

Reason three: Schools are often uncomfortable, dull and dirty. They lack equipment. Deskless children still squat in circles on some Irish school floors. Pitiful "apparatus" is in use; one schoolmaster proudly showed me his complete scientific equipment: it was a bent and corked U-tube designed to show that water always seeks its own level. The schools are frequently dirty. White turf dust is thick on the desks. Mud from the puddly unpaved yard is left to lump on the floor.

Who's to blame? England, says the Committee. In Ireland, England has decreed that managers of schools must clean and equip their schools. So the managers try to raise funds by voluntary subscriptions. In poor districts, it is very hard to get the money. In one school, a teacher told me that when his room was scrubbed he had to pay for it himself. In some of the most unhealthful schools, disinfection is provided by a philanthropic society, the Woman's National Health Association. But in England, says the Committee, England manages more efficiently; since 1870, she has ordained that each locality must pay a tax for school upkeep and maintain a local committee to administer the tax. Why not, asks the Vice-Regal Commission, a similar arrangement for Ireland?

## LEGALLY EXCUSED CHILDREN

**R**EASON four: "I don't have to." Large numbers of children are legally excused from Irish schools. Babies are legally permitted to go to work instead of to school. Ireland has 64,000 children under the age of fourteen in jobs—if girls kept home to do housework were counted there would be many more—while Scotland with virtually the same population, has 37,500.

Take these cases: Nine-year-old Patrick Gallagher may go to the Letterkenny Hiring Fair and sell his services to a farmer. Someone says to Paddy: "Why aren't you at school?" "Surely I live over two miles away from school." The law thinks two miles are too far for him to walk; so he may be hired to work instead. Reads the law:

A person shall not be deemed to have taken a child into his employment in contravention of this act if it is proved to the satisfaction of the court that during the employment there is not within two miles . . . from the residence of the child any . . . school which the child can attend.

Eight-year-old Michael Mullen drags black kelp out of a rush basket and packs it down for fertilizer between brown ridges in the little handspaded Donegal field. "Is there no school to be going to, Michael?" "There do be a school, but to help my da' there is no one home but me." The act says that the following is a "reasonable excuse for the non-attendance of a child, namely, . . . being engaged in necessary operations of husbandry."

Ten-year-old Margaret Duncan can be found sitting hunched up on a doorstep in a back street in Belfast. Her skirt and the step are webbed with threads clipped from machine-embroidered linen, or pulled from handkerchiefs for hemstitching. A few doors away little Helen Keefe, all elbows, is scrubbing her front steps. "But school's on." "Aye," responds Margaret, "but our mothers need us." For the act admits that another reasonable excuse is "that the child has been prevented from attending school by domestic necessity or other work requiring to be done at a particular time or place."

William Brady has a twelve-hour day in Dublin. He's out in the morning at 5.30 to deliver papers. He's at school till three. He runs errands for the "sweet"-shop till seven. "You get too tired to work in school? How does your teacher like that?" "Ash! She can't do anything." Intuitionally he knows that he can protect himself behind the fortress of words in the School Attendance act:

A person shall not be deemed to have taken a child into his employment in contravention of this act if it is proved that the employment by reason of being during the hours when school is in session does not interfere with the efficient elementary instruction of that child.

Who's to blame? England, says the Committee, or more particularly, the Parliament which passed the loose law called the Irish Education act of 1892, a measure which is humorously entitled "An Act to Improve National Education in Ireland." The Committee asks stringent amendments to the act.

## IRISH POVERTY

**R**EASON five: Many Irish children are too poor to go to school. There are all sorts of stories about Irish poverty. It is said there are Dublin basements from which ill-clad people dare emerge only at night. And there are dark Dublin tenement staircases where one can nightly tumble on bedless folk. Of the children in such "homes," the St. Vincent de Paul society in Dublin wrote in its last report: ". . . There are thousands of children in Dublin who never go to school because they have no clothes and during the winter months these children may be seen in their homes huddled over the semblance of a fire or often before the empty grate, trying to keep themselves warm." Nevertheless, the Vice-regal Committee states: "We do not fail to acknowledge with admiration how many of the poorest parents show great earnestness and self-sacrifice in seeing that their children go to school regularly and in good time, cleanly and respectably clad. But poverty still holds many at home."

Who's to blame? England? The report suggests neither cause nor remedy for Irish poverty. If its courage had lasted, would the committee have rested the reason of economic conditions in Ireland on English shoulders too? And would the remedy have been Sinn Féin? Or what? E. M. GREY.



## SOCIOLOGY

## The Easiest Way

**I**T was an alienist who was talking, and for all his daily round of unpleasant tasks, a most optimistic person. An optimist has been defined as a person who still carries a corkscrew in his pocket, but that is a bogus optimist, not at all like my friend the alienist who lives in a world of facts. He takes facts as they come, makes the best of them, and lives in hopes, always keeping, however, both eyes open. And it was to a relation of facts that he addressed himself. "I am sure you have noted," he said, "how much of life today is conducted on the theory that the easiest way is not only the cheapest way, but, on the whole, the best way." I had.

Now it is not strange that most of us are not averse to an extra cushion. Not strange, but the danger is in coming to think that life is all cushions. For the journey of all who have come to man's estate lies through a land where cushions are unknown. Some of us seem to find ourselves always in that zone, always within sight of the promised land, and always longing for the cool shade of the unattained Delectable Mountain. "So the easiest way," continued the alienist, "is the most sought way, but many are disappointed. And disappointment, in little things as well as great, is the cause of many a case euphoniously termed 'a nervous breakdown.'" It is also the cause of many a moral breakdown, and an active factor in producing a race of mortals abounding in wishbone, but almost totally lacking in backbone.

## THE COMPROMISE OF EDUCATION

**F**OLLOWING the line suggested by the alienist, it is curious to notice in how many fields we seek the easiest way. It was not so very long ago when little Alice, exhibiting some faint traces of musical genius, was set to long hours of practice, hours that might have been spent in tasks and occupations more congenial to her tender years, that in the end she might be graduated at Miss Spinks' Academy, a creditable performer on the piano. Old-fashioned O. Henry even goes so far as to tell of a dutiful daughter studying the mysteries of music, that her father's declining years may sink to rest in melody. But why all this pother, this study, this sacrifice, if I can purchase a machine to play the piano for me, or slip a flat record on a phonograph, and attune my ear to Paderewski? It's cheaper and it's easier. And I am told that today, by some magic formula, children are taught to read before they are taught the alphabet, inasmuch that after a few years the sequence of the dictionary is to them a mystery; and that to the modern school the old tables of addition and multiplication, the "perfectly Develish things" complained of by little Marjorie Fleming, are as unknown as the Pterodactyl.

The process of education has indeed become a kind of compromise between what the teacher wishes to impart and what the pupil is willing to accept; and the main purpose of the teacher's life is not to awaken a love of learning in the pupil, but so to sprinkle learning with the appetizing salt of ease that the pupil, not recognizing what is offered, may be induced to nibble for a spell, that is, until the salt is licked away. In the old days, as every student of history will attest, the old days of Orbilius, if there was any licking on the school program, the teacher, not the pupil, was the active agent. Only a stupid teacher will make a subject more difficult than it is, but it is equal stupidity to pretend that the shortest cut to learning is the easiest way.

## IN FAMILY AND STATE

**P**ROGRESSING from the school to the family unit no high degree of penetration is required to note how many marriages are unhappy because both husband and wife have always sought the easiest way. They have never learned that without sacrifice and restraint domestic society cannot long endure. If

children come to them, parents of this type will soon find that the easiest way of training a child is to give in to his whims, and will discover too late that this easiest way is also the worst way. Sweeping prohibitions, issued without thought, to meet a present exigency, and sweeping commands, enforced without consistency, are found in these family units, as they are also found in the larger social groups. These methods seem to satisfy the ethical demand; they soothe the conscience; but they are adopted because they lie along the easiest way.

For the last ten or fifteen years we have been fighting the social evil and the abuse of drink by a policy of suppression. It produces immediate results. But the results are obtained by driving the evil inwards, leaving the root of the evil untouched. It is easier to close a lawless saloon, or to raid a den of bad repute, than to create in the individual a motive that will last after the policeman has faded into the dim distance. Any "movement," and today they are innumerable, which proposes to reform cities and States, by law only, and neglects education and religion, is foredoomed to failure.

## KNOWLEDGE AND VIRTUE

**A**T the present moment various societies are endeavoring to repress licentiousness by a "campaign of advertising," setting forth the untoward effect of vice on physical health. If the campaign stops there, it will only do harm. It is a puerile psychology, this belief that men will always, or even usually, no matter how strong the temptation, avoid what may hurt their health or the health of the next generation. Many a sinner, as the old pagan poet bears witness, follows what is worse, although he knows what is better. If mere knowledge were a safeguard of conduct, every medical student should be far along the road to sanctity. But it is not written that personal holiness is the hallmark of this class, and, as a matter of fact, technical knowledge may point the way to safe indulgence. As far as I can see, the highly moral advertising of these associations will have no effect whatever, and should not have, on anyone who knows how to practise vice and escape the physical consequences. He will not avoid sin, or the psychic and social effects of sin, but he does avoid enumeration in the report of the Health Officer. So is the case closed, with the real evil doubly entrenched because it has been made respectable, or at least safe. But again they have justified "the easiest way."

## MORAL REFORMS AND MORAL CHAOS

**A**NOTHER easy method of destroying evil is to call it virtue. Conan Doyle assails the "rigid" divorce laws of England on the ground that they are the direct cause of bigamy and a falling birth-rate. At home we are taught that the only way of avoiding child-murder and increasing the birth-rate is to promote violations of the laws of God and nature. On both sides of the water we are afflicted with reformers of two schools; those who wish to throw off all restraint, as if man were an animal, and those who wish to leave nothing to his choice, as if he were not a rational animal. By one party we are asked to legalize iniquity, and by the other to make all things iniquitous. The result is moral chaos, and "moral reforms" which, however well-meant, promote nothing but principles fundamentally wrong. A policeman with a club is a sign of a civilized society. He represents the struggle of good against evil, and considered symbolically he attains a heroism not justified perhaps by his personal record. But, on the other hand, the policeman with his club neither leads to virtue nor, alone, preserves it. He is an irreducible minimum; a fasting breakfast that will just keep body and soul together until dinner; he is safety, not sanctity. But to attain a decent level, our ambition must be for sanctity, and that ambition must be nurtured from within.

Hence the approach to a cure for the moral evils that afflict private and public life consists in catching the citizen while he is yet young. If you can persuade him that the easiest way is

usually the worst way, he is ready "to nurture from within" the motive that will keep him far from the easiest way. Of his own accord, he may stray, but of his own accord, he will also return. To put this motive in the heart of the child is the chief work and the ultimate reason of the parish school today, the most powerful single social constructive force at work. Thus does the school founded in the Name of Him who walked along the way of suffering to death, operate as the most powerful single constructive force in the social body. For the school that is built near the Cross of Calvary has no door that opens on the easiest way.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

#### NOTE AND COMMENT

##### All Honor to Our Catholic Schools

TWO prize-essay contests were recently held by the New York American, one on the subject of Lincoln, the other on Washington. The contests were open to all elementary high schools of the city and country. The students of Regis High School, though in the press of the mid-year examinations, hurriedly contributed six papers upon Lincoln and though 5,000 essays were submitted four medals were awarded Regis. With more leisure for the Washington contest Regis won nine out of the one hundred prizes that were awarded to winners from among the 6,000 contestants. Says the *Regis*, the publication of this free Catholic high school conducted by the Jesuits in New York:

A remarkable fact about the contests was this, that not to Regis alone should praise be given, but to Catholic schools in general, for they had a far larger percentage in proportion than the non-Catholic schools. In the Washington Contest forty-two medals out of the hundred were won by Catholic schools. In the Lincoln Contest they captured twenty-four. This certainly should give the greatest encouragement to everyone who has made any sacrifice at all to make the Catholic school what it is today. We are very proud of the record of Regis High School and just as proud of the record of all our other Catholic places of education. We offer them our best wishes and sincerest congratulations on their fine work.

All honor then to our Catholic schools that in countless contests have borne away the laurels. Catholics indeed should be encouraged to support them with all their means, their energy and their enthusiasm.

##### No Cause for Catholic Self-Complacency

THE number of Catholics in the United States, as recorded in the latest "Official Catholic Directory," published by P. J. Kenedy and Sons, is 17,735,553. About 10,000,000 more are to be found under the American Flag in our various possessions. The increase during the past year has been 186,229. While the editor considers this "worthy of notice" in so far as large numbers of Catholics of foreign extraction have returned to their native countries and few immigrants have come to us, it is hardly an increase on which we have particular reason to congratulate ourselves. We have really not begun to carry on an active apostolate and have been entirely too much contented with simply holding our own. It is to be hoped that this spirit will at last be cast off by American Catholics, as indeed a more energetic attitude is already being taken in many parts. Our purpose should be to make of every Catholic an apostle. The times are ripe for this apostolate. The number of new parishes erected during the past year, we are told, was 148, lifting the total to 10,608, and there is an attendance of 1,701,213 in our parochial schools. We have done some good work, but we have decidedly no reason for vanity. We may well apply to ourselves this little bit of advice given by the *Epworth Herald* to its Methodist readers, who have been far more active in their cause than we in ours. Says the editor:

But what doth it profit, my brethren, to be everlastingly bragging about these things? The success of yesterday gives no guarantee of achievement today or tomorrow. Indeed, if we do not move more swiftly than we did yesterday, we shall fall sadly behind. We live in a new world. We face new conditions. We grapple new problems. Even now we are in the presence of appalling obstacles. We are fighting old enemies in new forms. Glorifying ourselves for past achievements, and burning incense on the altar of statistics will not help us to get anywhere. We must quicken our pace. We must aim higher, build larger, and strike harder. We must become more flexible—adaptable. We must take off every brake. We must turn on every pound of steam. We must open the throttle wide. We must be Christianly in earnest as we have never been. A Church of 20,000,000 members and adherents has no excuse for puttering with little enterprises. *We must do big business!*

Let us reflect on this for a quarter of an hour, and then begin to act upon it in all good earnest—not leaving the work to some one else to do. It is our work.

##### The Perilous Night-Key

THE night-key in the possession of the boys and girls in our city does more to foster crime than anything I know of," is the conviction of District Attorney Harry E. Lewis, reports the *Brooklyn Eagle*. "There are mothers," he continued, "who don't know where their girls go at night and fathers who don't care where their boys go or what they do in the night." He finds that last year there was a twenty-five-per-cent increase in the number of crimes committed in Kings County over the number committed during a similar period in 1918, and, more alarming still, that sixty-six per cent of last year's crimes were committed by boys and girls in age from sixteen to twenty-one. Mr. Lewis considers the general neglect of religious training and the abdication of parental authority, symbolized by the concession of a night-key to boys and girls in their teens, as two fertile sources of the late increase in crime. It would be profitable to know how many Catholic fathers and mothers could be justly indicted under the foregoing charge.

##### Goaded a People to Desperation

HOW cartloads of American papers are daily seized in the mails and burned by the British in Ireland is thus told in a letter from the Bishop of Killaloe, the Rt. Rev. Michael Fogarty, of County Clare. It was received by Father Edmund O'Shea of Philadelphia, and was printed in the *Irish Press* of that city:

It is great encouragement to have such good accounts from America. No American paper is now allowed into Ireland. Cartloads of them are seized in the post office by Dublin Castle and burned. We have therefore only to read between the lines of "exchange" cables and the English press. Our sufferings here are great indeed, but the national will is resolute. Dublin is now under martial law and no one allowed on the street between midnight and five o'clock, except with a permit and at "their peril." What next? God only knows!

The bishops have made at their last meeting in Maynooth, early in February a final pronouncement upon Ireland's claims to choose her own government. They have also rejected the education bill.

It is difficult indeed to exaggerate conditions existing in that country to-day. We need but turn to the indignant descriptions given in the English press. "Never," says the *Catholic Times* of Liverpool, "have the brutality and indecencies of the outrages committed by the British soldiers on the occupants of private houses in Dublin been exceeded by Prussians or members of any other race." It then describes the soldiers rushing with fixed bayonets into the rooms in which women and children are sleeping. Three similar cases are cited in the *Daily News*.